



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2009

No. 68

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 5, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN T. SALAZAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

PORTLAND'S STREETCAR EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week's decision by the Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood to authorize \$75 million in Federal funds to extend Portland's streetcar was not just important news for our community, although it was welcome. Indeed, it's going to create over 1,200 new jobs, construction starting almost immediately.

It's going to help serve as a magnet for development for a broad swath of

our community. But it is important for what it symbolizes as the potential for a new partnership with the Federal Government for the reintroduction of the modern streetcar into our communities across the country.

One hundred and twenty years ago, streetcars were very much in evidence here in Washington, DC and, indeed, from coast to coast. You could travel from Boston, Massachusetts, to Chicago, all but about 13 miles, uninterrupted, on streetcars and interurban electric systems. These streetcars shaped our modern communities with an efficient mechanism for transportation. People liked them, and it was something that helped develop housing and downtown density.

Over the course of this last decade, I am proud of the role our community has played helping to launch the first modern streetcar in the United States that is serving as a model for what can happen across the country. Our first line has already been extended three times. It has attracted over \$3.5 billion of new development, millions of passengers and, very important, the trips that aren't being taken by automobile, saving carbon pollution, fighting congestion, saving people money.

The decision by the Department of Transportation to administer the small starts legislation that I authored in the last reauthorization means that we can spread these benefits all across the country. There are dozens of cities, Boise, Idaho; Washington, DC; Tucson; Fort Lauderdale; Charlotte; Cincinnati; Des Moines; Miami; Providence, Rhode Island; New Haven, Connecticut; Seattle, Salt Lake.

The list is extensive of communities that are poised and ready to go with a modest amount of investment. The streetcar costs a fraction of what a light rail system would do. Our initial streetcar costs less than 1 mile of urban freeway.

But it's important to think about the ripple effects across the country. Not

only can you think multiplication of the 1,200 construction jobs that we have in Portland that could be visited in these communities, just on laying the tracks, reshaping the landscape, relocating the utilities, but it also is going to be a magnet for the development on the adjacent property. This is something that is a signal to developers large and small about a transportation alternative.

Then there is the opportunity for the first time in 58 years to have a modern American streetcar manufactured in the United States. We have developed in the City of Portland a prototype car that is being manufactured locally that's being delivered to this new project. Each streetcar results in 15 additional manufacturing jobs in our community, but also another 15 jobs per car for subcontractors across America. I have a list of subcontractors from coast-to-coast, particularly in the hard-hit manufacturing areas of the upper Midwest where machine shops are going to be providing parts for this modern American streetcar.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity for this Congress and the new administration to build on the promise, not just to have a streetcar line extended in the City of Portland, but to start a modern industry of rail transport, taking us back to the future, with the tram, with the trolley, with the streetcar, whatever one wants to call it, that will have a transformational effect on our communities while it helps revitalize our economy.

UYGHURS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5099

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was the author of legislation in 1998 that created the National Commission on Terrorism, whose report and recommendations were, unfortunately, ignored by both the Clinton and the Bush administration prior to 9/11.

Fast forward to today, and you can understand my concern when I hear that Attorney General Eric Holder is preparing to release trained terrorists into the United States. Several media outlets have been reporting that a decision is imminent on the release of Uyghurs presently detained at Guantanamo Bay. These detainees have been held at Guantanamo Bay since 2002 after being captured at terrorist training camps affiliated with al Qaeda.

Information I have received indicates these detainees may be far more dangerous than this administration has led the American people to believe. These detainees have been taught how to kill and terrorize by the same terrorist networks affiliated with the attacks on September 11, the USS Cole, U.S. embassies in Africa and the brutal beheading of Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl. Yet Eric Holder is considering releasing them into the United States.

Both the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security have reportedly raised concerns about the release of these detainees, who are members of the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Movement, a terrorist organization affiliated with al Qaeda. But yet Eric Holder will not release the information.

Let me be clear, we are not talking about transferring these people to prisons in the United States. They would be released free and clear to roam through your neighborhood, shop in your shopping malls and go wherever they want to.

And yet the Congress has not been briefed on this. We have called for briefings from numerous agencies but have been told by the agencies that the Attorney General's office will not allow them to come to the Hill.

This is, in some respects, basically a cover-up. That's right, the Justice Department will not allow career FBI and other government officials, who understand the issue, to come to the Congress to tell the Congress who these people are and what information has been prepared.

During his appearance before the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations Subcommittee, the Attorney General promised he would not play "hide and seek." Now he is hiding. He is hiding and keeping information from the Congress, and, more importantly, because the Congress doesn't appear to be doing anything about this, keeping the information from the American people.

All information, Mr. Speaker, about the capture and the detention of the detainees should be declassified, including a threat assessment for each detainee who would be released into the U.S. The American people need to

see this information, all of it should be released.

Eric Holder cannot just pick and choose what classified information he wants to release, only that which justifies his case, and cover up and keep quiet the others. These people should not be released into the United States.

Would you want to have trained terrorists living in your neighborhood? The answer is no, and I believe that Congress also is shirking its responsibility for not getting this information before a decision has been made.

MOVING IN A NEW DIRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the 111th Congress is moving in a new direction, a new direction with our clean energy jobs plan. Americans all over this country, whether you are from my home State of California or all the way over in Ohio, whether you are an ironworker or a teacher, whether you are retired or temporarily unemployed, Americans all know that we are facing a crisis, a crisis in our economic plan, a crisis with energy and a crisis with our climate.

The Democrats in this Congress have a solution that's a jobs generator and a money saver that will properly address each of these problems. The Democratic solution is our clean energy plan. The Democratic plan invests in clean energy jobs that can't be shipped overseas, in saving money for families and businesses through efficiency, and ending, finally, our addiction to foreign oil.

Republican opponents simply refuse to acknowledge the cause and the magnitude of this problem, and Republicans fail to acknowledge the change required today for the opportunity of growing jobs in this new economy. The U.S. has lost and is currently losing clean energy jobs and market share to China, Germany and Korea.

The U.S. consumers continue to spend \$400 billion, that's billion with a B, a year in the Middle East and Venezuela every time we fill up our gas tanks. Fortunately, Democrats in this Congress are working to fix this decade-old problem.

President Obama and the House Democrats have a plan that gets the economy moving again, retooling manufacturing plants, building wind turbine solar panels and clean cars and creating a smart grid, finally investing in energy-efficient jobs that can't be shipped overseas.

The Democratic plan is simple. It makes polluters pay and helps clean companies prosper so that they can hire more workers and we all know that that's what we need. It's the same American solution we put in place to successfully fight the acid rain in 1990, after which time electricity rates fell 10 percent and the U.S. economy added 16 million new jobs.

It's important to point out that the acid-rain solution was a bipartisan solution. My constituents in Los Angeles County don't want more rhetoric, they want solutions and specifics.

Consider what the Democratic energy plan will accomplish for this economy: Clean energy jobs provisions will create nearly 300,000 new jobs. The efficiency savings measures will create 222,000 new jobs by 2020. The clean energy jobs provisions will result in nearly \$100 billion in savings for consumers and businesses by 2030. The efficiency savings measures alone will result in nearly \$170 billion in utility bill savings by 2020.

□ 1045

The Democratic plan in this Congress will impact every facet of the lives of Americans. We must take care and craft a bill that will promote new job growth around this Nation, a bill that will have energy infrastructure to keep these jobs and industries alive in the United States for generations to come—we have learned that—and a bill that will promote our national and economic security.

The Democratic energy plan is a blueprint for legislation that the American people have called for, a change in a new direction. I look forward to working with my colleagues to moving America in that right direction and finally to true energy independence.

WHY IS NUCLEAR NOT INCLUDED?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, presently the majority is developing their own energy legislation through the Energy and Commerce Committee. I serve on the Subcommittee on Energy. We have had several hearings and many, many witnesses, including Vice President Gore. This legislation is entitled the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009. But, my colleagues, it imposes a massive national energy tax on every single American, especially those who are low income and elderly individuals.

Now, if reducing carbon dioxide, creating jobs and promoting domestic energy sources were truly their objective, then nuclear energy should be a central component, you would think, of this legislation. But it is not.

Nuclear power already provides the United States with over 20 percent of its electricity, and 73 percent of its CO₂-free electricity. When it comes to affordable, near-term reductions of CO₂ and other atmospheric emissions, the importance of nuclear energy cannot be overstated.

Like wind and solar energy, nuclear energy is emission free, which means CO₂ free. However, unlike wind and solar, nuclear energy can provide vast amounts of power on a constant basis. Wind and solar certainly have a role to

play in America's energy mix, but in order to obtain clean, CO₂-free energy, it seems that such a major piece of legislation should address the regulatory and policy issues that obstruct new nuclear energy power from being developed in the United States.

But what makes nuclear energy potentially transformational is its simple versatility. Today, the Nation primarily uses nuclear energy for electricity generation. Electric power production amounts for roughly 40 percent of America's total energy production. Nuclear accounts for 20 percent of electricity here in the United States. But clean, affordable nuclear power can also be used to produce energy for industrial applications, and even for transportation, which accounts for 21 percent and 29 percent of U.S. energy consumption, respectively.

For example, some reactor types could be used in the chemical industry for plastics production and for refinery operations, all of which use vast amounts of carbon-based energy to produce heat which is necessary for their industrial activities. Nuclear energy could also be used to produce synthetic fuels that could run America's cars. While these technologies are not commercially viable today, they are the types of things that could be possible, if the Federal Government would develop a regulatory and policy structure that was more conducive to growth in the nuclear energy industry.

Nuclear energy is also a jobs creator. According to The Nuclear Energy Institute, the nuclear industry has created more than 15,000 jobs in recent years, all without even beginning construction on a new nuclear power plant. These include jobs in the sciences, manufacturing and construction sectors that private investors have created as they prepare to meet future construction demand. Once construction begins, up to 2,000 workers will be required to build each new plant and approximately 600 will be needed to operate it.

The energy bill being developed focuses too much on the process of energy production, rather than on the product itself. For example, it creates a renewable energy standard that mandates only certain types of limited energy production, such as wind and solar. This approach artificially eliminates energy sources, including those that have not even yet been invented.

If CO₂ reduction is truly the objective, then maximizing America's nuclear resources should be a top priority. In fact, as Secretary of Energy Chu testified at one of our hearings, nuclear energy should be part of this legislation. France uses nuclear energy to produce almost 80 percent of the electricity they have, and also they have developed methods to reprocess the waste. In fact, they have been so successful that almost all of the waste product has been reprocessed. Japan and Canada have also successfully developed nuclear energy.

So, my colleagues, the priorities we need to establish require a major restructuring effort from Congress and the administration that emphasizes market-based reforms that ensure long-term regulatory stability and policy predictability. Most importantly, these reforms can be done without additional cost to the taxpayers.

Without such an effort, the billions of dollars of private capital needed to expand America's nuclear capacity will simply not be invested. These private investments will ultimately be what is needed for the Nation to achieve real reductions in CO₂ emissions and create a new, clean energy economy.

STRICTER OVERSIGHT OF CREDIT CARD ISSUERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House passed the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. This week the House will take up anti-predatory lending and mortgage fraud legislation. These bills are the next step as we work to rebuild our economy in a way that is fair and consistent with our values.

The Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act of 2009 will curb abuse in predatory lending, a major factor in the Nation's highest home foreclosure rate in 25 years. The bill would outlaw many of the most egregious industry practices that have marked the subprime lending boom, and it would prevent borrowers from deliberately misstating their incomes to qualify for a loan.

But I would also like to get back to the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, because that is such an important piece of legislation. As I mentioned, it passed 357-70 in this body, and I do urge that the other body take up this legislation as rapidly as possible.

The Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights has had such broad bipartisan support because these credit card issuers and companies have benefited from an uneven playing field for so long. Regular people across the country and across my district have been victimized by these unfair and abusive practices, and Congress has now finally heard their stories. One of their stories was featured today in an editorial in the Syracuse Post-Standard, my hometown newspaper.

"Temple Baptist Church in Baldwinsville is the kind of customer that credit card companies used to reward with lower interest rates, not higher ones. The church paid its credit card bill on time and always paid at least the minimum due.

"But without explanation, Advanta Bank raised the church's interest rate from 18 percent to a whopping 36.9 percent. The higher rate had already been applied to \$8,000 in new purchases, according to the Reverend Aaron

Overton. He was shocked, just like thousands of citizens who have found themselves in similar positions.

"Fortunately for Overton and other consumers, their outcry was loud enough for Congress to pay attention. Last week, the House of Representatives approved the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, which would prohibit sudden and retroactive rate hikes."

Then the editorial goes on to say later that this bill is good, we need to do more, and that "Congress needs to carefully examine how credit card companies conduct business, the kinds of interest rates they charge and what other schemes are being practiced that hurt customers. Overton says he probably could have gotten a better deal from the Mafia than from his credit card company. It does appear that some companies are shaking down customers as the economy worsens."

Mr. Speaker, I will include the full editorial for the RECORD.

The point is this: We cannot any longer allow these kind of practices to occur. The model that makes this occur is the fact that at one point in our country, all lending, including credit card lending, was based on the fair principle that a bank or other institution would lend out money and then would make money on the interest and then the principal would be paid back.

But these credit card companies have now targeted people that cannot afford to pay back that principal and instead continue to get higher and higher fees. Yet they are too responsible, like Reverend Overton, to run away. He is not going to go anywhere. That church is not going to go anywhere. So there is no excuse to raise those rates and to have those fees, except that the company wants to make more money.

My concern, the concern of my newspaper at home and the concern of many of us, is that these credit card companies, before this bill fully takes effect, before the Senate is able to pass it, will take advantage of this all the more. But to them, Mr. Speaker, to them I have a clear message, and that is we have got our eyes on you and you shouldn't try it, because if you do, we are going to put this into effect much, much earlier, as our Chairman BARNEY FRANK has said.

I do not believe that you should have a lawyer to get a credit card. We have lawyers to get a new house, often when you have a house closing. But when it comes time to get a credit card, you shouldn't need a lawyer. These 30 page contracts, frankly, that people don't read, but I tell you, if you did read them, there is only a couple of sentences that matter. Those are the sentences that say the credit card issuer can do everything and the consumer can do nothing. This has to end. This practice has to end. We must assure fairness, and that means getting the Senate to pass a strong credit cardholders' bill of rights, and in both Houses and down the street at the

White House we have to keep an eye on this industry and make sure they don't take advantage of the customers further during this recession.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial from the Syracuse Post-Standard for the RECORD.

BAD CREDIT

Temple Baptist Church in Baldwinsville is the kind of customer that credit card companies used to reward with lower interest rates not higher ones. The church paid its credit card bill on time and always paid at least the minimum due.

But without explanation, Advanta Bank raised the church's interest rate from 18 percent to a whopping 36.9 percent. The higher rate had already been applied to \$8,000 in new purchases, according to the Rev. Aaron Overton.

He was shocked just like thousands of citizens who have found themselves in similar positions.

Fortunately for Overton and other consumers, their outcry was loud enough for Congress to pay attention. Last week, the House of Representatives approved the "Credit Card Holders' Bill of Rights," which would prohibit sudden and retroactive rate hikes.

The Senate is expected to pass similar legislation, according to Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., who said the Senate bill would contain "important protections for consumers and is a giant step forward for anyone who uses a credit card."

Let's hope so.

The credit card companies have been allowed to ride roughshod over their customers, employing jaw-dropping practices in a nation that supposedly operates by fair and transparent financial rules.

In fact, Congress needs to go farther than the House did in its bill.

As Rev. Overton pointed out, credit card companies should be made to refund the money they received from the outrageous fees.

State Attorney General Andrew Cuomo was able to work out such a deal recently with JP Morgan Chase & Co. It refunded \$4.4 million to 184,000 cardholders Cuomo said were wrongly charged a monthly \$10 fee.

Most of the regulations in the Credit Card Holders' Bill of Rights will not take effect until next year. But Rep. Dan Maffei, D-DeWitt, and Rep. Carolyn Maloney, D-Manhattan, sponsored an amendment that would ensure that one crucial provision takes effect within 90 days of signing that companies give customers 45 days notice before raising rates.

Maffei says the House bill is just the beginning of stricter oversight of credit card issuers. As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, he says he has heard complaints about credit company practices throughout his district. He plans to hold hearings in Syracuse this summer.

That's good. Congress needs to carefully examine how credit card companies conduct business, the kinds of interest rates they charge and what other schemes are being practiced that hurt consumers.

Overton says he probably could have gotten a better deal from the Mafia than from his credit card company. It does appear that some companies are shaking down customers as the economy worsens.

Lawmakers must put an end to such practices immediately.

TRIBUTE TO JACK KEMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a good and great friend who was also a great American leader that we lost this last weekend, Jack Kemp.

Jack Kemp was not only an inspiration to many, but he is a model for those of us who serve in this House. Through the years, his searching intellect, his impressive leadership ability, his buoyant personality, and, yes, his dedication to his family, was something to inspire all of us who had the opportunity to know him and those of us who were able to call him friend.

I remember that he told me one time that as busy as he was, he always used to take the time to try and give some inspiration to his children, and at times he would write a little note to them and put it under their pillow, and oftentimes it would say these simple words: "Be a leader." I copied that from Jack, and I would remind my children before they would go to bed to think of themselves as leaders, not just followers.

Jack had that kind of effect on people. I was speaking to another Member of Congress recently and I said, when you think of Jack Kemp, you immediately have a smile on your lips because of that buoyant personality, that ultimate sense of fairness.

Today, we talk about athletes having a swagger. Jack didn't walk with a swagger. He walked with the grace of an athlete. And there was a certain graciousness about him as he approached anybody on this floor. Democrat, Republican; liberal, conservative; white, black, Hispanic, it didn't matter. Jack treated you all the same.

Jack genuinely believed that there was goodness in everybody, and even when disappointed he would still come back to that fundamental thought of his that if you could reach just a little bit deeper, if you talked to someone just a little bit longer, if you fought a little bit harder, maybe you could find agreement and maybe we could move this country forward.

It was a great experience being one of Jack's friends. I often thought that there might be someone out there who doesn't like Jack Kemp, but I don't think there was a single person that Jack disliked. And that could be irritating at times when he was an ally of yours and you were dealing with a difficult issue, and you would say, Jack, don't you hear what they are saying? Doesn't it get you irritated? And he would give you that half crooked smile and have that raspy chuckle, and he would just keep on going.

I remember when I was with him, as were several other Members in the House, I believe it was over in the Cannon Caucus Room, when Jack announced his candidacy for President in 1988. At the end he said something to this effect. He said, "While I am leaving the House, I will always be a man of the House." And I believe he was, until the day he died.

Today, as we deal with difficult issues, it would do us good to remember Jack; not as someone of the past, not as someone who made great contributions to this country in his life, but someone whose spirit remains and whose example should be an example to us all.

We dealt with difficult issues when he was here in the House; the Contras, Soviet Jewry, the Cold War, the march of communism, high taxes, difficult inflation, questions about where we were going. And Jack dealt with all of those issues. But he dealt with those issues not only with a smile, but with a clarity of vision and an approach that invited people to sit down and debate with emotion, but with civility.

□ 1100

There could be no better example for us today. The incandescence of his personality, the generosity of his spirit, the genuineness of his friendship, I thank God for all of those things. And I think today as we deal with these difficult issues, rather than just to have a tip of the hat to people like Jack Kemp, we ought to say, your inspiration, your leadership and your example will continue to burn brightly in the hearts of Members of this body and we shall always remember your belief in the goodness of America and the goodness of its people.

God bless you, friend.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT PLAYS CRITICAL ROLE IN VIRGINIA'S 11TH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And before I begin my remarks on a different subject, I want to thank my colleague from California for his remarks about our departed colleague, Mr. Kemp. I think it is important that all of us remember his sense of decency, civility and collegiality, something we need to remind ourselves of in this body today.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the Recovery Act will save or create 3.5 million jobs across the country, but today I rise to highlight one of many important instances where the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 plays a direct and critical role in my own district, the 11th District of Virginia.

It is important every so often to take a step back from the macro view and look at the Recovery Act's positive impact on the local economy. I want to point out the Act's impact on the Greater Prince William Community Health Center and the thousands of people the center employs and serves in northern Virginia. This nonprofit facility provides a wide variety of affordable health care services to the uninsured and the underinsured on a sliding

fee-based scale as well as those with health insurance. The health center is the primary caregiver for over 4,000 patients annually, with nearly 32,000 patient visits each year. It provides school physicals, internal and family medicine, physical exams, disease screening, laboratory work and pharmaceutical assistance. It treats diabetes, hypertension, asthma, respiratory infections and so many other medical conditions. Without this health center in Prince William County, many of the facility's patients would be forced to use hospital emergency rooms for their primary care which cost all of us about \$6 billion a year, or they receive no care at all.

Mr. Speaker, in the weeks before the \$1.1 million grant for the Greater Prince William Community Health Center which was announced on March 2 as part of the stimulus funding, the center's management was actually preparing for an orderly and permanent shutdown of this vital facility. The economic crisis increased demand for health care services and local funding sources had frankly dried up. Nonetheless, the dedicated staff of health care professionals continued to do their jobs and continued to provide quality health care to the center's patients, even though they were not always certain they would ever receive a paycheck. The health center management desperately sought private and public funding to keep the center going, but the same economic crisis that was driving more patients to the health center was also taking its toll on this non-profit provider. At a time when the health center was anticipating a doubling of patients in need of its services, the future looked bleak. It's hard to describe the sense of relief I heard when I contacted the center's management to inform them that the Recovery Act had provided a new lease on life. Thanks to the Recovery Act, this outstanding community resource will not become another unfortunate casualty of the recession but instead will continue to provide much-needed cost-efficient health care to low- and moderate-income individuals and families. And because of this vote of confidence and this investment, they've been able to attract additional investment as well, ensuring their future.

I recently toured the Greater Prince William Community Health Center and had the opportunity to spend time with care providers and several patients. I met with William, a construction worker recently laid off due to the economic downturn. He injured his back on the job but after being laid off had no insurance to seek treatment for his constant, chronic pain. Thanks to the health center in Prince William County, he was able to see a doctor, received initial care, and was referred to the University of Virginia Medical Center for back surgery. In time, thanks to the center, William will recover, be able to return to work, and live a productive and hopefully pain-free life. I

also met Connie, who told me about her father's debilitating diabetes and how financial constraints placed his life in jeopardy. Connie heard about the center, brought her father there, and today he is on insulin with a much improved quality of life.

Thanks to the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the hardworking staff at the Greater Prince William Community Health Center will continue to fill a critical need in my district in Virginia. This is only one of thousands of examples around our country of the Recovery Act at work, saving jobs and frankly saving lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Greater Prince William Community Health Center is not unique. Throughout America, the Recovery Act is having a positive impact on the lives of millions of Americans. While no one solution will cure the recession overnight, the Recovery and Reinvestment Act is one piece of the mosaic of actions this Congress has undertaken to restore our Nation's economic health, protect the well-being of the American people, and make sure that our economy gets moving again.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious, Lord our God, today across this Nation, many celebrate Cinco de Mayo, marking the struggle of the Mexican people for freedom and independence.

We bless You and praise You, Lord, because these various devotions and festivities remind all of us of the large part immigration has played in the formation of this great country with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

Mexican Americans, as so many before them, Lord, have shared their rich heritage with others while they have sought health, safety, and education for their children as well as political and cultural recognition.

Bless their deeply felt family values and religious convictions. We pray always for a greater integration into American life where all live free from fear, segregation and prejudice.

We ask Our Lady of Guadalupe to join us in our prayer for Your blessing upon all Hispanic Americans and especially upon our neighboring country of

Mexico. Grant peace and security both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE MORTGAGE REFORM AND ANTI-PREDATORY LENDING ACT OF 2009

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this week I am proud that the House of Representatives will be voting on H.R. 1728, the Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act of 2009.

This legislation will make critical reforms to end the abusive and predatory lending practices that have left so many Americans facing foreclosure.

In my district in Orange County, California, we have seen the results of abusive and predatory lending too frequently as foreclosures have weakened our neighborhoods and our communities, and it has forced many of our people out of their homes. Most of these foreclosures are the result of "toxic loans" that were issued by several subprime lenders in Orange County, California.

For that reason, I am particularly pleased that H.R. 1728 will ensure that lenders make loans that benefit the consumer and prohibit lenders from steering borrowers into higher-cost loans.

In addition, the legislation will establish a simple standard that all institutions offering home loans must ensure so that borrowers can actually repay the loans they receive.

I am very pleased that we will be considering this bill, which addresses the reckless lending and lack of oversight, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

CALIFORNIA WATER

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because California is in the middle of a water crisis. California's current drought is not like other droughts

because California is suffering from a devastating combination of a natural dry spell and a federally imposed dry spell.

In December 2007, a Federal judge ordered restrictions on water project operations in the delta to help protect threatened species, the delta smelt. The negative impact has been extraordinary. The restrictions have resulted in the loss of nearly one-third of the supply that 25 million Californians depend on from delta operations. Farmland throughout California's Central Valley is going fallow while farmers struggle to find work. In Southern California economic growth is being thwarted because any new construction is jeopardized by a lack of proven water supply.

There is no evidence that the federally imposed pumping restrictions have benefited the delta smelt. If this Congress is going to continue to give Federal agencies the authority to take actions that kill jobs and harm our economy for the benefit of a species, then the American people deserve clear evidence that these actions benefit the species.

RECOGNIZING AND CONGRATULATING THE PINAL COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR FIGHTING BACK AGAINST THE DRUG CARTELS

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a deputy with the Pinal County Sheriff's Office noted a speeding van and observed likely packages of marijuana through the window. After a brief car chase, the deputy was able to secure the van and found 476 pounds of marijuana. This successful bust is yet more evidence that our local law enforcement is playing a vital role in fighting back against the drug cartels.

I congratulate Sheriff Babeu and the entire Pinal County Sheriff's Department for this seizure, which will keep drugs out of our community.

Our local law enforcement in Arizona deserve recognition for a job well done. With more resources, they do even more to protect our borders and keep our communities safe.

RECOGNIZING MR. JEFF JACKSON

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it's with great pride that I rise to recognize Mr. Jeffrey Walter Jackson of the Sixth District of Georgia upon his retirement as Head of School for the Mount Vernon Presbyterian School in Sandy Springs, Georgia.

Jeff Jackson has been a dedicated and visionary leader. He challenges himself and all around him to dream big dreams, work diligently on positive goals, and inspires a servant's heart.

During his tenure, since 2002, at Mt. Vernon, Mr. Jackson introduced honors and advanced placement courses, expanded the sports program to 31 teams, and fostered varied activities including a debate team and the Fellowship for Christian Athletes. He oversaw the establishment of a new Upper School to serve 9th through 12th grade students and a 30-acre expansion of the campus.

In his faithful commitment to the values of Christian education, Mr. Jackson has been a role model for teachers, administrators, community leaders, but especially students. And now he will further his positive influence as the executive director of the Georgia Independent School Association.

Mr. Speaker, our community and this Congress commend Jeff Jackson for his continuing and exemplary service and extend to him our very best wishes in his new role.

PREDATORY LENDING

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, to put our Nation on the road to recovery, we have to do several things: First, we have to begin to clean up the economic mess that we have inherited after the past 8 years. Secondly, we have to rewrite our laws to guarantee that everyone has a fair shake and a fair opportunity to make it in today's economy. And together we will.

Last week I was very proud to stand here and vote for the Credit Cardholder's Bill of Rights, and today I rise in favor of the Mortgage and Anti-Predatory Lending Act. This bill would help end the predatory lending that is a major factor in the many, far too many, home foreclosures now taking place.

The bill would prohibit lenders from steering their customers into higher-cost loans, would ensure that borrowers actually have the ability to pay back the money that they are taking out, and would establish a simple standard for all home loans.

I believe we have to work hard for people everywhere to guarantee that they can make it and keep their heads above water. Let's pass the Mortgage and Anti-Predatory Lending Act and build a better future for everyone.

MAKE R&D TAX CREDIT PERMANENT

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President announced tax reforms that would pave the way for making the research and development tax credit permanent.

R&D is the lifeblood of our economy, and this tax credit provides companies with an incentive to invest in tech-

nology and expand their operations. In 2005, more than 70 percent of R&D tax credit dollars nationwide went toward wages for highly skilled jobs.

Since 1981, however, Congress has extended the credit 12 times with extensions as short as just 6 months. Retroactive extensions leave companies in uncertain circumstances for long periods of time beyond the expiration date.

This is why I have introduced bipartisan legislation with Mr. BOCCIERI of Ohio that would make the R&D tax credit permanent. Unlike other proposals to make the R&D tax credit permanent, H.R. 1545 would also offer a bonus tax credit for companies who manufacture their products in the United States.

We shouldn't wait to make the R&D tax credit permanent. We should act now to sustain the manufacturing base that is so critical to this country's future.

ENERGY

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Conservation and Clean Energy Independence Act of 2009, a bipartisan piece of legislation that extends our efforts from last Congress, the 110th Congress, with Congressmembers MURPHY, WALZ, CAPITO, WILSON, ABERCROMBIE, myself, and many others.

This legislation is to develop a new policy that is comprehensive in nature that will, one, reduce our dependency on foreign sources of energy and, two, develop the robust renewable portfolio that Americans want to see. This effort is common sense. It's PAYGO neutral. It would enhance our path toward energy reduction of our dependency on foreign sources and improve our national security.

I'm a firm believer that we have to use all the energy tools in our energy toolbox. This legislation does just that. In the near term, 1 to 10 years, choosing oil and gas and nuclear. In the intermediate, 10 to 20 years, building a robust, renewable portfolio that will give Americans an energy policy that we believe our Nation deserves.

CAP-AND-TRADE EXEMPTIONS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in the past, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle railed against the Bush administration for an energy policy they say was written by energy lobbyists and rewarded oil and gas industry companies. Now that they control both the Congress and the White House, that type of behavior which they railed against now seems to be acceptable.

The cap-and-trade legislation being considered in the Energy and Commerce Committee is based on a blueprint of a plan put forward by a coalition of outside groups called USCAP. USCAP claims to favor government regulation of greenhouse gasses; yet, one of the leading members of the group will receive a generous exemption in the legislation to build new coal power plants without the onerous restrictions that will prevent others from building.

The majority are allowing industry members to write legislation that benefits them in exchange for supporting their cap-and-tax plan that will raise energy prices for all Americans. That is hypocritical and it's unethical.

ENERGY/BUDGET

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the American Recovery Act made a down payment on a new clean energy economy, with \$39 billion worth of investment in smart grid technology, energy efficiency, and our renewable energy sector, all of which will lower energy costs and create good-paying, permanent American jobs.

Congress must match this reform and this investment with meaningful investments in our fiscal year 2010 budget.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, let me say that I fiercely defend the power of the free market. But for decades the energy markets have increased our reliance on foreign oil, quashed American innovation, and eroded our national security. It is time, way past time, for us as elected representatives to lead and take those steps necessary in this budget to finally move our energy sector to a clean American sustainable economy.

□ 1215

CAPTAIN FRANCES GREENE—LADY WARRIOR

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Frances Greene, charter member of the Greatest Generation from Beaumont, Texas, joined the United States Army in 1941, even before Pearl Harbor.

When World War II started, it saw the Army Nurse Corps on the front lines of battle. Captain Greene was stationed overseas in the hot South Pacific. And she clearly remembers her unit being bombed daily by Japanese planes.

The 23-year-old nurse faced the war head on, and nurses like her were responsible for saving the lives of American soldiers and marines that caught the brunt end of battle. Because of these special saviors of soldiers, World War II had a record low post-injury

mortality rate. Many of the injured are alive today because of Captain Greene and the other 59,000 wonderful women that volunteered to face the enemy in faraway lands.

Mr. Speaker, at 91, Captain Greene still talks about her service to our country with deep patriotism and fervor. She is an amazing lady warrior.

Today I am proud to know Captain Frances Greene. We should honor her and all the women that served in the great World War II. They defended our country with their valor and helped bring our wounded home to America when it was over, over there.

And that's just the way it is.

MORTGAGE REFORM IS NEEDED

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has some of the least-affordable housing in the country. Many of my constituents have more than one job just to make enough to put food on the table and pay their bills. Others have lost jobs due to the bad economy and the downturn in tourism.

Families are struggling to stay in their homes. In Hawaii, foreclosures are up 500 percent from a year ago, and one in 29 homes with high-cost loans are likely to go into foreclosure.

Forestalling foreclosure is often an exercise in frustration for homeowners. Some people in Hawaii are 2 or 3 months behind in their mortgages and are spending hours trying to reach out-of-state lenders in a different time zone to get their loans modified. To make matters worse, lenders tell them that their paperwork is lost and slap them with fees and penalties.

We recently passed H.R. 1106 to help families like these restructure or refinance their mortgages. We also need to pass H.R. 1728 to support counseling efforts, provide foreclosure prevention assistance and strengthen loan standards.

MEDIA IGNORES GOOD NEWS FOR GOP

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with a newly elected Democratic President, and a Senator recently switching to become a Democrat, the national media have tried to imply that Americans have moved away from the Republican Party's values and priorities.

But the facts tell a different story. A new poll by the Pew Research Center shows Americans are, in fact, taking a conservative turn on issues like abortion and second amendment rights. The number of people who support legalized abortion has dropped to its lowest point ever, and the number of people who say it is important to protect gun owners' rights increased to its highest point ever.

These numbers indicate a shift toward, not away from, some of the core principles of the Republican Party. But you won't see much in the media about Pew's survey. It doesn't support their liberal leanings.

CURB ABUSIVE AND PREDATORY LENDING

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of long overdue legislation to crack down on predatory mortgage lending. This week the House will consider legislation to curb abusive and predatory lending, a major factor in the Nation's highest home foreclosure rate in 25 years and the precursor to the greatest economic downturn since the Great Depression.

The Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act of 2009 prohibits lenders from steering borrowers to higher-cost loans and protects tenants who rent homes that go into foreclosure.

Mr. Speaker, the situation we find ourselves in did not happen overnight, but there is a new day dawning in America with this new President and this new Congress. By passing this legislation, we will mark one more step toward restoring economic prosperity to all Americans by protecting consumers, as we did last week with the credit card bill, and from the many vile and unscrupulous practices that have directly contributed to the mortgage crisis.

OPPOSE RELEASE OF UYGHURS

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in firm opposition to any decision by the Attorney General to release the trained terrorists known as Uyghurs from Guantanamo Bay into the neighborhoods, that's right, in American neighborhoods. I believe this would be a terrible decision that can needlessly endanger American citizens.

If Eric Holder proceeds down this dangerous road, he has an obligation, an obligation, to the American people to release all of the information about the capture, detention, and threat posed by each detainee. If the Attorney General believes these trained terrorists pose no threat, then why not release all of this information to the Congress and, more importantly than even to the Congress, to the American people.

Also, Mr. Speaker, why will the Attorney General not allow career people in the FBI, DHS and CIA to come up and brief the Congress? It's time for Eric Holder to make a decision to release this information. These trained terrorists should not be released into American neighborhoods.

HONORING MARK HEBERT

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an old-fashioned newsman who delivered critical information to the viewers of WHAS-TV in Louisville for the last 22 years. This weekend he retired his microphone and camera to work for the University of Louisville, and his reporting will be greatly missed.

As a former journalist who moved on to another field myself, I can hardly begrudge him the change, but I can't help but mourn the void it leaves. At a time when news is adapted to sound bites palatable to texters and twitterers, Mark was never content with what he found on the surface. Time and again, he peeled that proverbial onion until someone cried.

I am proud to call Mark my friend and proud, too, that my former newspaper, LEO Weekly, has named him Louisville's best journalist. But if the accolades and friendship had an effect on him personally, you would never have known it professionally. I found myself the subject of his scrutiny on more than one occasion. We would call the stories positive at times and negative at others, but the words that always showed up were thorough, intelligent, and fair.

The loss for WHAS and local media is the university's gain, but our entire community is better for his 22 years of reporting and the high standard of journalism set by Mark Hebert.

PREDATORY LENDING

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the staggering rate of mortgage fraud and predatory lending in this Nation.

As our country reels from the continued impact of the recession, it's time to take action that will rebuild our economy in a way that's fair and consistent with our values.

Mr. Speaker, this week we will consider H.R. 1728, the Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act. This bill is an important step toward preventing the abusive and predatory lending practices that have contributed to the highest home foreclosure rate in 25 years.

The bill will outlaw many of the egregious energy practices that mark the subprime lending boom and bust. It sets a Federal floor, enabling States like my home State of Maryland to better protect consumers.

Now, as we pick up the pieces in this recession, we must learn from our mistakes, by strengthening regulations of our financial system. It means that we must ensure that all consumers are treated fairly and that the mortgage

lending industry must be transparent and accountable to our seniors, minority borrowers, and all consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1728 and additional reforms to stop mortgage fraud and predatory lending.

EDUCATION FOR 21ST-CENTURY VETERANS

(Mrs. DAHLKEMPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the brave men and women who have served their country in uniform, many of them in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We owe our veterans a debt of gratitude for putting their lives on the line for our country. However, I believe that we must show our gratitude, not only with our words, but with our actions.

That is why I am pleased that all eligible veterans can now take advantage of the 21st-Century GI Bill. Any member of the military who has served on active duty since September 11, 2001, can receive up to 4 years of college tuition, including money for housing and books. Eligible veterans include activated Reservist and members of the National Guard. And as of last Friday, they can apply online at the VA's Web site.

This new GI Bill will open up doors for thousands of veterans throughout western Pennsylvania and across the country, and I encourage all our veterans to go online immediately to take advantage of the benefits they have earned.

I offer my sincere gratitude to all who have served our Nation, both our soldiers and their families.

BRINGING COMMONSENSE REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION TO OUR FINANCIAL SYSTEM

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the House takes up the anti-predatory lending and mortgage fraud legislation. These bills are the next step as we work to rebuild our economy in a way that is fair and consistent with our values.

The Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act of 2009 will curb abusive and predatory lending, a major factor in the Nation's highest home foreclosure rate in 25 years. The bill would outlaw many of the egregious industry practices that marked the subprime lending boom and would prevent borrowers from deliberately misstating their income to qualify for a loan. The bill will ensure that mortgage lenders make loans that benefit the consumer and prohibit them from steering borrowers into higher-cost loans.

This week Congress will also vote on legislation to create an outside commission to investigate the causes of the current financial and economic crises in the United States.

LOOK INTO CAUSES OF ECONOMIC MORASS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as Congresswoman WATSON was saying, we will vote this week on the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act. That act will do several things, one of which will set up a commission to look into the causes of the economic morass that we are presently experiencing.

Congress did that in the Great Depression, and it led to the reforms that kept this country safe for a long time. Then we fell to the arguments that were made, starting with the Reagan administration, about the free market and the free market which took us where we are today.

The free market, unfettered, has caused this problem. But a study needs to be taken by the Congress, and that's what that bill would do.

It would also expand the abilities of several State governments and non-profits to look into fraud and extend Federal fraud statutes to the TARP and to the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. People who fraudulently steal from the government or steal these funds are engaging in as un-American an activity as anybody could do short of espionage.

I endorse the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act and hope that we could have a commission to get to the bottom of what's happened. This past week, Mr. Speaker, I watched "Wall Street," the movie. It's shameful and it's today's world.

INSULATION

(Mrs. HALVORSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring light to a very important but often overlooked industry that can play a huge role in improving energy efficiency, both in our buildings and through greenhouse reductions on a wide-reaching scale: it's mechanical insulation.

Buildings are responsible for 40 percent of U.S. energy demand and 40 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions. Mechanical insulation, as it is used in mechanical piping and equipment for heating and air conditioning in industrial, commercial and other types of buildings, can reduce over 37 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions. It can also generate more than \$3.6 billion in industrial energy efficiency, saving and creating more than 27,000 jobs annually.

Savings and benefits are swift and can last for many years when properly

implemented. As an advocate of energy efficiency measures, I encourage others to become more aware and utilize this industry in making new and existing buildings and facilities more efficient.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

GERALDINE FERRARO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 774) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, as the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 774

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GERALDINE FERRARO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, and as we commend the dedicated service of our Nation's public servants during Public Service Recognition Week, I am pleased to present H.R. 774 for consideration.

This legislation would designate the United States postal facility located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City,

New York, as the Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building in honor of an exceptional public servant who has dedicated over 30 years of life to serving our country.

□ 1230

Introduced by my colleague, Representative CAROLYN MALONEY of New York, on January 28, 2009, and reported out of the Oversight Committee on March 18, 2009, by unanimous consent, H.R. 774 enjoys the strong support of the New York House delegation.

Born in the city of Newburgh, New York, to her father Dominick, an Italian immigrant restaurant owner, and her mother Antonetta, a first-generation Italian American seamstress, Geraldine Ferraro stands as a living testament to an often-cited passage from her historic address to the 1984 Democratic convention: "America's history is about doors being opened, doors of opportunity for everyone, no matter who you are, as long as you are willing to earn it." Ms. Ferraro spoke these words upon her introduction as the first female and Italian American major party candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States.

Ms. Ferraro graduated from the Marymount High School in Manhattan in 1952. She was awarded a scholarship to Marymount Manhattan College, and in 1956 earned her bachelor of arts degree, becoming the first woman in her family to receive a college education.

In her subsequent service as a public elementary school teacher in Astoria, Queens, Ms. Ferraro attended Fordham University School of Law at night. She courageously ignored an admission officer's admonition that she would be taking "a man's place" in the class. In 1960, she received her juris doctorate as one of only two women in her graduating class of 179 students.

Following her admission to the New York State bar in 1961, Ms. Ferraro practiced law part time in the private sector while raising her family. In 1974, she was appointed to serve as an assistant district attorney for Queens County. In 1977, she was chosen to head the recently established Queens County Special Victims Bureau, where she specialized in cases involving abused women and children.

Ms. Ferraro was elected to the United States Congress in 1978, and honorably represented New York State's Ninth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1979 to 1985. Throughout her tenure in Congress, Ms. Ferraro devoted much of her legislative attention to women's rights and human rights advocacy. To this end, she admirably sought passage of measures such as the Equal Rights Amendment and the Women's Economic Equity Act.

In 1984, Ms. Ferraro became the first woman and the first Italian American to be nominated to the Vice Presidency of the United States by a major American political party when she was chosen by Democratic Presidential can-

didate Walter Mondale to join the 1984 national ticket. Her historic nomination continues to stand as evidence that, as Ms. Ferraro proclaimed in her acceptance address, "America is the land where dreams can come true for all of us."

Following her remarkable Vice Presidential run, Ms. Ferraro remained active in public and community service. In 1993, she was appointed by President Bill Clinton as Ambassador to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. As noted by President Clinton, Ms. Ferraro's appointment came in recognition of her longstanding dedication to international women's rights issues. Ms. Ferraro continues to serve the Nation through a variety of public and private sector efforts, specifically as a widely regarded author and political commentator. She keeps the American public well informed regarding issues of public policy.

Through her nonprofit organizational work, she continues her commitment to creating educational and professional opportunities for women, as well as addressing wage and training disparities in the workplace. Furthermore, as a cancer survivor, Ms. Ferraro admirably and successfully advocates in support of increasing much needed funding for cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor a dedicated public servant through the passage of H.R. 774, and by designating the 21st Street postal facility in Long Island City in honor of Geraldine Ferraro. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 774.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 774, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4602 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, as the Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building.

Geraldine Ferraro has spent her life advocating and achieving on behalf of women across the globe. She was born on August 26, 1935, in Newburgh, New York, the daughter of a first-generation Italian American mother and an Italian immigrant father. After high school, she worked her way through Marymount Manhattan College, at times holding three jobs simultaneously. She was the first woman in her family to attain a college degree, and she subsequently became a licensed New York City school teacher.

While still teaching the second grade, Congresswoman Ferraro earned her law degree, attending Fordham law school at night. She was one of only two women in her graduating class of 179, and was admitted to the New York State bar in 1961. She managed to raise three children while working part time as an attorney in her husband's real estate firm. In 1970, she was elected president of the Queens County Women's Bar Association, and in 1974 she was appointed Assistant District Attorney for Queens County, New York, at a time when female prosecutors were rare in

New York City. During her time in the district attorney's office, she became a strong advocate for abused children, and rose through the ranks to head the Special Victims Bureau, which prosecuted rape, and child and domestic abuse cases.

In 1978, she won election to the United States House of Representatives from New York's Ninth Congressional District in Queens. She labeled herself a "tough Democrat" and ran on law and order issues.

Upon entering Congress, Congresswoman Ferraro made an immediate impression on her party's leadership and quickly rose through the leadership ranks. She established a reputation in Congress as an advocate for women's rights and gender equality. Then, in the 1984 Presidential election, Walter Mondale chose her as his running mate, making her the first ever female to run on a major party national ticket. Her historical nomination was the culmination of a lifetime of firsts for this lawyer from Queens.

Her accomplishments also include her appointment by President Clinton to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. President Clinton eventually chose her to be the United States Ambassador to the Commission, stating that she was "a highly effective voice for the human rights of women around the world." She has spent a lifetime breaking barriers and shattering glass ceilings. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to honor the many achievements and tireless advocacy of Geraldine Ferraro.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the lead sponsor of this resolution, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this and so many other things.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 774, legislation to name the Long Island City Main Post Office after former Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro. The main post office is located at 4602 21st Street in Long Island City, Queens, in the district Ferraro represented with distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives for 6 years. It is also located in the district that I am honored to represent. It is a grand building and a fitting building for an extraordinary woman.

A trailblazer, role model, leader, Ferraro has been a pivotal figure in American history. When Walter Mondale selected her in 1984 to be the first female Vice Presidential candidate on a national party ticket, she became an icon. The night she was nominated—and I was there with great excitement to see the first woman on a national party ticket—she took to the microphone and told the crowd, "American history is about doors being opened, doors of opportunity for everyone, no matter who you are, as long as you are willing to earn it."

And although doors have continued to open for women, the marble ceiling

remains intact. It took more than two decades for another woman to be given a similar opportunity, and none have won. Geraldine Ferraro continues to symbolize the hope and expectation that one day a woman will be elected to the White House. Ferraro has spent her entire career opening doors, breaking down barriers, and helping others to follow her. She was one of only two women in her law school class. She was appointed assistant district attorney for Queens County, New York, at a time when women prosecutors were extremely rare.

When she entered Congress in 1979, she was one of only 13 women in the House. Nonetheless, she quickly earned the respect of her colleagues and was elected to the secretary of the House Democratic Caucus for the 97th and 98th Congresses. Granting her a seat on the influential Steering and Policy Committee, Ferraro served on the Post Office and Civil Services Committee, the Public Works and Transportation Committee, the Select Committee on Aging, and in 1983 was appointed to the Budget Committee.

In her work on the Post Office and Civil Services Committee, the newly elected Ferraro helped enact a widely demanded local ZIP Code that gave the Queens neighborhoods of Ridgewood and Glendale a Queens-based code, 11385. Previously, Glendale and parts of Ridgewood were serviced under 11227, Bushwick's ZIP Code in Brooklyn. But when the 1977 blackout plunged Bushwick into riots, her constituents noticed that insurance companies and banks were raising premiums and rates in the entire ZIP Code even though Queens remained largely balanced and unscathed by the violence and looting. Although the Postmaster General told Ferraro that a ZIP Code change like this had never been done before, he would go forward if the Congresswoman could collect some 50,000 signatures. And that is what she did.

In January of 1993, President Clinton appointed Ferraro as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. She attended the June 1993 World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna as the alternate U.S. delegate. In October of 1993, Clinton promoted her to be head of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights Delegation, with the rank of United States Ambassador. She was vice-Chair of the U.S. delegation to the landmark September 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, and I accompanied her as a representative for this body at that historic conference.

Ferraro has written three books, cohosted a political talk show, co-founded a consulting management company to help corporations train women leaders, and worked on the boards of dozens of organizations. Today, she is of counsel at the law firm of Blank Rome, where she advises clients on a wide range of public policy issues. And whatever her many accom-

plishments have been in the area of Queens that Ferraro once represented, people remember her as their good friend, their neighbor, and their Congresswoman, a tenacious fighter who represented them and their interests. She never forgot them and they have never forgotten her. Thousands of her former constituents use the Main Post Office every week, and they will be delighted to have this important neighborhood institution named in her honor.

So I am thrilled to be the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to name the U.S. Post Office located on 21st Street in Long Island, New York, as the Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building.

I served in this body with Geraldine Ferraro, a former Queens County district attorney, and I join my colleagues in congratulating her and her family in a well-deserved honor and wish her well.

As we deal with this issue, though, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is a pressing matter of national security which directly affects the welfare of the American people which is not being addressed, and the American people deserve to know what is happening.

□ 1245

Geraldine Ferraro represented the people of New York City, a city which was forever changed on a sunny September morning when two planes slammed into the World Trade Center killing thousands and awakening our country to the murderous aims of the terrorist network globally. Thirty people from my congressional district lost their lives that day.

Countless books have been written since, which highlight miscalculations and missed opportunities on the part of the policymakers in the intelligence community who failed to recognize the severity of the threat our country is facing leading up to 9/11. We can no longer say we do not know the threat, and yet this administration is on the precipice of making a decision which, given what we know, is unthinkable.

Press reports and other information I receive indicates that President Obama's decision regarding the release into the United States of a number of Uyghur detainees held at Guantanamo Bay since 2002 is imminent. The detainees are trained terrorists. They were held at a facility which was home to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of 9/11 who took pleasure in beheading Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl.

There have been published reports that these detainees were members of the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Movement, a designated terrorist organization affiliated with al Qaeda.

Now, just this April, the U.S. Treasury froze the assets of Abdul Haq, the leader of this group, the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Party, known as ETIM. This is the same group that the detainees are reportedly affiliated with. The Treasury Department targeted Haq as part of their efforts to shut down the al Qaeda support network. Upon making the designation, Treasury Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence said, and I quote what our Treasury Department said: "Abdul Haq commands a terror group that sought to sow violence and fracture international unity at the 2008 Olympic Games in China."

Few have been more critical of the Chinese Government than I have. But terrorism is terrorism. American citizens were present at the Olympic Games. Terrorism knows no boundaries. It must not be tolerated anywhere. American career government officials risked their lives to capture these people. What if they had not been captured? Would they have then left this terrorist training camp and gone off to wreak terrorism somewhere in China killing innocent men, women and children of China?

Yet the U.S. Congress and the American people are left utterly, and I'm increasingly concerned, in the dark. The administration will not allow any career person from the FBI, from the CIA, or from the Department of Homeland Security to come up and tell the Congress about these detainees. The American people, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve more. After learning that this decision was imminent, I requested briefings from a number of relevant agencies. But all have told me that Eric Holder, our Attorney General of the Department of Justice, is preventing them from speaking out, speaking to me or other Members, if you will, on this issue.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is the Department of Justice withholding this information from the American people? Why is proper congressional oversight, which American people expect of their elected representatives, now being thwarted? This is not the time to play games. The stakes are too high, not just with regard to this specific group of detainees; but speaking more broadly, our enemy is empowered by perceived weakness. What message are we sending when one branch of government stonewalls another on a matter with undeniable national security implications?

Again, I call on the Justice Department to declassify and release all information regarding the capture, detention and threats posed by these detainees or others that they may consider releasing into the U.S. Any intelligence assessment of these Uyghurs must take into account not only their previous training at terrorist training camps, but their potential subsequent exposure and radicalization while they were at Guantanamo Bay.

Andrew McCarthy, a former Federal prosecutor who led the 1995 prosecution against Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman who was found guilty of planning the

1993 World Trade Center bombing, wrote just today that the administration is playing "fast and loose with the declassification of information."

Mr. Speaker, this information ought to be released to the American people before any decision is made. And with that I thank the Chair.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's support for the naming of this Post Office Building on behalf of Geraldine Ferraro.

At this point, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) who is also in her own right a champion of women's rights. So it is appropriate that she speak on this bill as well.

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise and associate myself with the remarks of my friend, CAROLYN MALONEY, in support of naming a post office after former Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro.

Geraldine Ferraro was a great role model to thousands of women across this country. Not only is she a mother, not only is she a grandmother, not only is she a wife, but she is telling all of those little girls who are going to school that you can be a great Congresswoman. You can run for Vice President of the United States of America. One day, we will have a woman as President of the United States of America, and Geraldine Ferraro played an important role in preparing the people for that event.

Geraldine Ferraro is a fighter. She stands up for what is right. There are some people who see a problem and just walk on. And I know that my friend, Geraldine Ferraro, whether it was an issue that she had to address in her congressional district or whether she saw a wrong in this great country of ours, she is the kind of person that says, I have got to do something about it. So I'm very proud to have Geraldine Ferraro as a friend.

I know that after the naming of this post office, there are many people who will look at that post office and say, This is a good woman. I am going to lead my life consistent with the principles that Geraldine Ferraro has shared with all of us.

So I thank you all for taking this step to name the post office. And I look forward to working together to ensure that all the principles, all the values, all the commitments that Geraldine Ferraro has made will be enshrined, and certainly she will continue to be a role model for all those young people who come after her.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of naming the United States Postal Service building located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building," after former United States Representative Geraldine Ferraro.

It is with great pleasure that I support this designation, which commemorates the life of one of New York's most remarkable women. Geraldine Ferraro has had a distinguished career marked with many achievements. She began her career as a New York public school

teacher, while simultaneously earning her law degree from Fordham University at night. She worked as an attorney the Queens New York District Attorney's office, where she helped establish the Special Victims Bureau. In 1978 she ran a successful campaign to represent New York's Ninth District in the United States House of Representatives. Throughout her six years in Congress, she rose quickly through the ranks to become a notable leader in her party. As a result of her success, it is no surprise that in 1984 Walter Mondale selected her as his running mate on the Democratic ticket, making her the first female vice presidential candidate.

Although she did not win the election, she undoubtedly reshaped politics as we know it and paved the way for future women leaders. She has since authored several books and has overcome a battle with multiple myeloma, a dangerous form of blood cancer. She now remains active in politics, weighing in on the issues and candidates that influence and shape our country.

A daughter of Italian immigrants, Geraldine Ferraro has been a trailblazer and role model, not just for women, but for all Americans in search of living the American dream. From congresswoman to vice presidential candidate to author to cancer survivor, Geraldine Ferraro is a true inspiration and deserves to be honored for her achievements through this designation.

Mr. DUNCAN. At this time, I will urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to support both Member CAROLYN MALONEY, the lead sponsor of this measure, and Mrs. LOWEY, who also spoke on behalf of this measure, in naming this post office after Geraldine Ferraro.

I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 774.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE O'DAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1397) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CAROLINE O'DAY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1397, which would rename the U.S. post office located in Rye, New York, after former Congresswoman Caroline O'Day. And I would like to thank Chairman TOWNS and the entire New York delegation for their support of this measure. Born in 1875 on a plantation near the rural town of Perry, Georgia, Caroline O'Day's experiences growing up in the post-Civil War South instilled in her a lifelong commitment to world peace and social welfare. The energy and passion with which she gave voice to those in need was the hallmark of her career in Congress.

Caroline O'Day's interest in politics was piqued when during a suffrage parade her husband, Daniel O'Day, reportedly asked his wife why she was not marching herself. Soon, she joined the West Chester League of Women Voters and in 1917 worked with Jeannette Rankin to advance the enfranchisement of New York women 3 years before passage of the 19th amendment.

Together with her close friend, Eleanor Roosevelt, O'Day helped found the Women's Division of the New York State Democratic Committee and was elected chairwoman of the New York delegation to the 1924 Democratic National Convention, becoming the first woman from either major party to hold the position.

In 1934, Caroline O'Day was elected to one of New York's two at-large congressional seats. The second woman in the history of this body to chair a major committee, she quickly became known as a skilled legislator unwilling to compromise her principles for the sake of political expediency.

During her four terms in the House, Representative O'Day was a leading voice for avoiding unnecessary armed conflict and fought to improve the quality of life of underrepresented minorities in the inner city and migrant agricultural workers. In particular, she was deeply troubled by the effects of poverty on at-risk children and tire-

lessly advocated a dramatic expansion, or "national investment," of Federal programs to protect them.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman O'Day not only faithfully represented the myriad interests of her constituents from Buffalo to Brooklyn, she put one of the first cracks in the glass ceiling as one of only six women in the House.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the number of women serving in the House has since risen to 76. And while this does not reflect the percentage of women in the American electorate, through common interests and coordinated effort, this relatively small group has had a significant effect on Federal policy. We women currently serving in this esteemed body stand on the shoulders of pioneering women like Caroline O'Day, whose grit and determination helped them not only overcome gender bias, but lead this Nation through depression and war.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring this legislation, which honors the life and service of Congresswoman Caroline O'Day, to the House floor today. And I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to join my fellow Members of Congress in recognizing a former New York Congresswoman and women's rights advocate by designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building" for her extraordinary contributions to the State of New York and to American public life.

Born Caroline Love Goodwin in 1869 on a plantation in Perry, Georgia, she was one of four daughters of a socially important family in Georgia. Despite the economic hardships that were widespread during the Reconstruction period, her father's success allowed her and her sisters to attend the prestigious secondary school called the Lucy Cobb Institute.

□ 1300

After graduation in 1886, she briefly studied art in New York at Cooper Union before sailing to Paris, France, where she enjoyed a stimulating life among the great artists of the time.

An independent-minded woman, she supported herself as a freelance artist for the next 8 years. While living in Europe, she met Daniel O'Day, an oil businessman, who persuaded her to abandon her artistic career and return with him to New York in 1901. Although past the age of 30 and beyond the age when most women married in that era, she married Daniel O'Day and moved to Rye, New York.

It was in Rye, New York, where Congresswoman O'Day would start her successful career as a civic activist and politician. Her power of persuasion was so great that although her husband was not politically active, he did become an enthusiastic advocate of women's suffrage and in 1916, after his sudden

death, Congresswoman O'Day began working on issues of social welfare and female suffrage in New York. She became active with the New York Consumer's League, the Women's Trade Union, and the Democratic Party. Through these and other organizations, she became close friends with other prominent social activists, including Eleanor Roosevelt.

After spending many years with a well-known activist working for women's suffrage and multiple organizations, she was urged to run for public office. Congresswoman O'Day first ran and won a seat in Congress in 1934 with the public support of her good friend Eleanor Roosevelt.

As a well-regarded Member of Congress, Congresswoman O'Day worked on a number of labor reforms, particularly for the child labor protections of the Walsh-Healey Government Contracts Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. She had a lifelong concern for protecting the rights of disadvantaged people.

As an extension of that concern, Congresswoman O'Day sponsored legislation which stayed the deportation of 7,000 illegal aliens. She strongly supported the Federal anti-lynching law, was instrumental in arranging the memorable concert of Marian Anderson in 1939 scheduled for DAR Constitution Hall, and supported expanding the quota for Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany.

In 1940, despite her sickness, Caroline O'Day won a fourth congressional term. Because of declining health, she did not return to Washington, although she did handle some of her House duties from her home. Sadly, on January 4, 1943, the gentlewoman from New York died at her home.

Congresswoman Caroline O'Day may have been best described after her death by Eleanor Roosevelt who wrote, "Her high ideals and integrity were an inspiration to all who knew her or felt her influence, and her generosity touched many people and many causes in which she believed. Her passing is a loss not only to her family but to the world."

It is with great respect and pleasure that I support H.R. 1397.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for consideration this legislation that will designate the United States postal facility located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the Caroline O'Day Post Office Building in honor of a wonderful and dedicated public servant.

Caroline Love Goodwin O'Day was born in the city of Perry in Houston County, Georgia, on June 22, 1875. Ms. O'Day completed her academic studies at the Lucy Cobb Institute in Athens, Georgia, in 1886, and initially chose to pursue a career as an artist, spending 8 years as an art student and painter in Paris, Holland and Munich.

In 1902, Ms. O'Day relocated to what would become her lifelong hometown of

Rye, New York, where she would embark on an admirable and dedicated career devoted to public service. Following her husband's sudden death in 1916, Ms. O'Day became actively involved in the women's suffrage movement as well as a number of other social welfare groups, including the New York affiliate of the National Consumer's League and the Women's Trade Union League, dedicated to improving wages and workplace conditions for both women and children.

In furtherance of her social and community causes, Ms. O'Day also served on the Rye school board and played an integral role in the establishment of the women's division of the Democratic State Committee. In 1923, she was elected by State party leaders to head the women's division as well as serve as chairman of the Democratic State Committee. Then First Lady of the United States, Eleanor Roosevelt, described Ms. O'Day's election to one of the State party leadership positions as "breaking down a major barrier against women in the Democratic Party."

That same year, Governor Al Smith appointed Ms. O'Day to serve on the State Board of Social Welfare, a position that she held for over a decade. In 1924, Ms. O'Day was elected as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention and was elected as chairman of the New York State delegation, marking the first time that a woman had received such an honor from either major political party.

Ms. O'Day proceeded to serve as a delegate for the party's next three national conventions. In 1934, at the age of 65, Ms. O'Day was elected to Congress as a Representative at Large in the 74th Congress. As noted by the author, Paul DeForest Hicks, in his profile of Ms. O'Day that appeared in the New York Historical Association Magazine, Ms. O'Day's 1934 campaign materials "evidenced a commitment for higher standards for wage earners, adequate relief to taxpayers, a sound and enlightened fiscal policy, friendly foreign relations, and advanced opportunities for women in government."

In addition, as recently noted by Rye City Councilman Mack Cunningham, Ms. O'Day's tenure in Congress was marked by a strong interest in social welfare measures. It is noteworthy that she was only the second congresswoman to chair a major committee, the Committee on Election of President, Vice President and Representatives.

On a final note, I would like to mention that, as a New York Representative at Large, Ms. O'Day played a vital role in facilitating the construction of the Rye Post Office that is now the subject of this legislation. In fact, she presided over the post office's ribbon-cutting ceremony on September 5, 1936, and now we stand here some years later seeking to name this post office after Ms. O'Day.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor this dedicated public servant with the passage

of H.R. 1397, and let us follow the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) by designating the Rye Post Office in honor of Caroline O'Day. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1397.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1397.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 299) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 4 through 10, 2009, and throughout the year.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 299

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize and promote the important contributions of public servants and to honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the Nation through work at all levels of government;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service in every city, county, and State across America and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling, involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas Federal, State, and local governments are responsive, innovative, and effective because of the outstanding work of public servants;

Whereas the United States is a great and prosperous Nation, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the Nation benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of these highly trained individuals;

Whereas public servants—

(1) defend our freedom and advance the interests of the United States around the world;

(2) provide vital strategic support functions to our military and serve in the National Guard and Reserves;

(3) fight crime and fires;

(4) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(5) deliver Social Security and Medicare benefits;

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and the Nation's parks;

(8) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunity and healthy working conditions;

(9) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(10) help the Nation recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(11) teach and work in our schools and libraries;

(12) develop new technologies and explore the earth, moon, and space to help improve our understanding of how our world changes;

(13) improve and secure our transportation systems;

(14) promote economic growth; and

(15) assist active duty service members and veterans;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States, and are on the front lines in the fight against terrorism and in maintaining homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent America's interests and promote American ideals;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, abuse, and dangers to public health;

Whereas the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, as well as those skilled trade and craft Federal employees who provide support to their efforts, are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances, and contribute greatly to the security of the Nation and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflict in defense of this Nation and its ideals, and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas government workers have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas, and serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants;

Whereas May 4 through 10, 2009, has been designated Public Service Recognition Week to honor America's Federal, State, and local government employees; and

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week is celebrating its 25th anniversary through job fairs, student activities, and agency exhibits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great Nation during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(2) salutes government employees for their unyielding dedication and spirit of public service;

(3) honors those government employees who have given their lives in service to their country;

(4) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession; and

(5) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 25th anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week. From May 4 through May 10, 2009, Public Service Recognition Week is designed to commemorate the hard work, dedication and sacrifice made by our Nation's Federal, State, and local government employees.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, I am proud to have introduced H. Res. 299 as it sends a strong message to public workers everywhere that their work and effort on behalf of this country is valued and their services appreciated.

I introduced H. Res. 299 on March 30, 2009, and I am pleased to report that the measure has been considered and reported from the Oversight Committee as of April 23, 2009.

While this measure has the support of only 60 Members of Congress, it affords each and every one of us a chance to celebrate and pay tribute to the thousands of civilian and military personnel that commit themselves daily to the greatness and prosperity of our country. To all of the public servants that touch our lives, our great teachers, our mail carriers, our firefighters, we say "thank you." From the soldiers in the field to the agents on the border, the service rendered by public service workers may be the key to our basic functionality, but yet it is so often overlooked.

While Public Service Week lasts only 7 days, I believe that the contributions and sacrifices of public servants should be recognized and appreciated throughout the entire year. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce, my highest priority is to improve the working conditions, benefits and opportunities afforded to our civil servants. They deserve our highest recognition and praise, but all too often they are criticized and undervalued. During this session, I have introduced or supported legislation that would provide paid leave to Federal employees that are new parents, that would protect postal workers' jobs from being contracted out to the private sector, and that would allow Federal employees a credit for their unused sick leave when computing their retirement annuities.

Commemoration of Public Service Recognition Week runs from the first Monday through the first Sunday of May and will involve job fairs, student activities and agency exhibits, all designed to highlight the significance of public service and to encourage young people to consider public service. This week offers all Americans the opportunity to both recognize and learn more about the significant contributions that public sector employees make on a daily basis to our local communities, States and our Nation.

The theme for this year's celebration is "Government Goes Green." This will

give government agencies an opportunity to showcase how they are working to have a positive impact on the globe through environmentally friendly practices and energy-efficient initiatives.

Whether it is the Environmental Protection Agency keeping our air and water safe, the Department of Interior preserving and managing our Nation's parks, or the Department of Energy developing cleaner fuel alternatives, public servants have been on the forefront of protecting our Earth.

Also, Public Service Recognition Week offers a chance for Americans, especially young Americans, to learn more about various careers in the public service. By showing younger generations that hard work, dedication and passion in serving the common good leads to a productive and successful career, we will inspire our young people to seriously consider entering the field of public service.

In our busy daily lives, we often take for granted the hard work and services provided by government employees. These people are what make our country move, and they make it the greatest country in the world. Therefore, we have an obligation to recognize and honor the contributions made by those who put their love of country above personal motivations.

In short, they are all American heroes and the subject of today's measure, H. Res. 299, the commemoration of Public Service Recognition Week.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask a letter from the Office of Personnel Management Director, John Berry, praising our Nation's public employees to be entered into the RECORD. I know that Director Berry and the President alike share my commitment in making the Federal Government a better place to work. Therefore, it is with a warm sense of appreciation and deep gratitude that I stand to urge support for this measure.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2009.

Hon. STEPHEN F. LYNCH,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on the Federal Service,
Postal Service, and District of Columbia,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to thank you for your sponsorship of H. Res. 299, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 4 through 10, 2009, and throughout the year.

As you know, Public Service Recognition Week, celebrated the first Monday through Sunday in May since 1985, is a time set aside each year to honor the men and women who serve America as Federal, State and local government employees. Throughout the Nation and around the world, public employees use the week to educate citizens about the many ways in which government serves the people and how government services make life better for all of us.

As the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), Public Service Recognition Week is the perfect time to spread President Obama's call to public service and to recognize public employees. I am com-

mitted to making the Federal Government a better place to work by speeding up the hiring process, increasing opportunities for veterans, and implementing programs that help employees balance work and family life.

Thank you for your continued leadership in recognizing the hard work of our public servants during Public Service Recognition Week and I look forward to working with you to make the Federal Government a better place to work.

Sincerely,

JOHN BERRY,
Director.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to rise today in support of H. Res. 299 honoring the millions of dedicated public employees who steadfastly serve our Nation. These highly competent and well-trained public service employees who work at all levels of government, Federal, State and local, are a great example of an excellent workforce both here and abroad. They exhibit their professionalism and expertise as they handle the enormous amount of work that flows through all levels of government on a daily basis. Their sense of dedication and innovation are at the very core of this country's successes. Keeping our Nation running and safe are the emergency responders, the educators and medical personnel, and all others who are part of a larger group that we proudly call public service employees. Without them, our country simply could not function.

When speaking of public sector employees, we must particularly note the brave men and women who serve in the Armed Forces who continue to make all Americans proud as they dedicate their life and limb to keeping us all safe throughout the world. Those on the front lines deserve special recognition for their public service which is truly above and beyond the ordinary call of duty. These soldiers are provided vital strategic support from fellow public service employees both at home and abroad.

When natural disasters hit communities around the country and the world, it is our public service employees who provide support at every level. For this, they should also be commended. It is an honor for me to congratulate these fine citizens for performing challenging and many times thankless jobs with dedication every day. Because of our public service employees, we have a country that is safe and secure for all of us.

□ 1315

For these reasons, I express my strong support of Public Service Recognition Week.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the millions of men and women, in and out of uniform, who devote themselves daily to doing the public's work.

Without the service of these dedicated and selfless individuals, the country could not function. Public servants are on the front lines in Iraq and on the front lines fighting the Swine

Flu. They are the first to come to our aid in a crisis and the last to leave a burning building. They teach our children, pass our laws and bind our wounds. Without them, our lives would come to a halt. For their dedicated and continued service to the nation, I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of public servants everywhere and in support of Public Service Recognition Week.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for supporting this measure. I appreciate his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 299.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ELIJAH PAT LARKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1271) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1271

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ELIJAH PAT LARKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to present H.R. 1271 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States postal facility located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building," in honor of a man who dedicated over 25 years of his life to public service.

Born to farm worker parents in the then-segregated city of Pompano Beach, Florida, on April 29, 1942, Elijah Pat Larkins graduated from Blanche Ely High School in 1960, and subsequently attended Tennessee State University.

In 1962, Mr. Larkins embarked on a career as a community housing activist, first serving as a housing director with a Pompano community action agency. In 1969, Mr. Larkins was one of the two honorees in the State of Florida to receive the prestigious Ford Foundation Fellowship, which afforded him the opportunity to attend the National Housing Institute in Washington, D.C., and become a federally-certified housing development specialist.

In 1972, Mr. Larkins brought his new expertise back to his community by creating the Broward County Minority Building Coalition, an organization dedicated to ensuring the participation of minority-owned companies in south Florida's construction sector.

In 1982, Mr. Larkins first won elected office, becoming only the second African American elected to the Pompano Beach City Commission, and only the eighth African American local elected official in Broward County. He proceeded to serve 19 consecutive years.

Notably, Mr. Larkins served an unprecedented seven terms as the first African American mayor of Pompano Beach. He also served three terms as vice mayor, elected by his fellow city commissioners.

Under Mr. Larkins' leadership, the city of Pompano Beach initiated a variety of successful efforts to advance modern affordable home development and promote the growth of small and minority-owned businesses.

In addition to elected service, Mr. Larkins played an active role in a variety of social and religious organizations, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Broward County Boys and Girls Club, the United Way, and the Urban League.

Regrettably, illness forced him to retire from public service in May of 2008. In February of 2009, he passed away at the age of 66, after a 16-month battle with brain cancer.

As noted by Mr. Larkins himself, he always had a great affinity and love for the city of Pompano Beach, and it was his hope that he would be remembered for giving all that he had to public service.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor this dedicated public servant through the pas-

sage of this legislation by dedicating the Pompano Beach Postal Facility in honor of Elijah Pat Larkins. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1271, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building."

Elijah Pat Larkins dedicated his entire life to public service, and the citizens of Pompano Beach, Florida, are better off today because of his tireless service. In 2008, the Florida League of Cities recognized him for 25 years of public service.

Mayor Larkins was the first of 10 children born to a farmer and homemaker in Pompano on April 29, 1942. Nicknamed "Prez," and voted class president every year from 5th to 12th grade, he graduated from what is now Blanche Ely High School.

He grew up in a segregated society, but spent a lifetime in public service fighting for equal rights, and was elected Pompano Beach's first African American mayor in 1985, and subsequently served a record seven terms. Prior to that, he served 19 consecutive years as City Commissioner.

A Ford Foundation Fellow, Mayor Larkins was a federally-certified housing development specialist who created the Broward County Minority Builders Coalition, and was a director of his own, not-for-profit, Malar Construction, Inc., in Fort Lauderdale.

In fact, throughout his career in public service, he made significant contributions in housing, working tirelessly to ensure that safe and adequate housing was available to all. While mayor, he also helped transform the city's economy from agricultural to urban, all while mentoring local civic-minded residents and minority activists.

In addition to his many professional achievements, he took an active role in countless public service, social, and religious organizations, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Broward County Boys and Girls Club, the Juvenile Justice Intensive Halfway House, and Hopewell Missionary Baptist Church. In fact, he was affiliated with more than a dozen national, State, and local political and service groups.

Mayor Larkins was twice married to retired schoolteacher Bettye Lamar Larkins, with whom he had a son, Gerald Todd. He also had another son, Tory Larkins, from a prior relationship. He is also survived by his nine younger siblings and his mother, Alberta Griffin.

In recognition of Mayor Larkins' commitment to public service and tireless efforts on behalf of the citizens of Pompano Beach, I urge all members to join me in supporting H.R. 1271, which will designate the United States Postal

Service Facility located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, in his honor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I just want to note that the lead sponsor of this resolution to name this post office after Elijah Pat Larkins is our friend and great Congressman from Florida, Mr. HASTINGS. I just want to recognize his leadership in bringing this to the floor. I thank him for his energy and his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1271.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 382) supporting the goals and ideals of National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 3 through May 9, 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 382

Whereas charter schools deliver high-quality education and challenge our students to reach their potential;

Whereas charter schools provide thousands of families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children;

Whereas charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public entity that are responding to the needs of our communities, families, and students and promoting the principles of quality, choice, and innovation;

Whereas in exchange for the flexibility and autonomy given to charter schools, they are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their financial and other operations;

Whereas 40 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam have passed laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas approximately 4,700 charter schools are now serving approximately 1,400,000 children;

Whereas over the last 15 years, Congress has provided substantial support to the charter school movement through startup financing assistance and grants for planning, implementation, and dissemination;

Whereas over 365,000 children are on charter school waiting lists nationally;

Whereas charter schools improve their students' achievement and can stimulate improvement in traditional public schools;

Whereas charter schools must meet the student achievement accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the same manner as traditional public schools, and often set higher and additional individual goals to ensure that they are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas charter schools must continually demonstrate their ongoing success to par-

ents, policymakers, and their communities, some charter schools routinely measure parental satisfaction levels, and all give parents new freedom to choose their public school;

Whereas charter schools nationwide serve a higher percentage of low-income and minority students than the traditional public system;

Whereas charter schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, Congress, State Governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the United States; and

Whereas the 10th annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 3 through May 9, 2009, is an event sponsored by charter schools and grassroots charter school organizations across the United States to recognize the significant impacts, achievements, and innovations of charter schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the 10th annual National Charter Schools Week;

(2) acknowledges and commends charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our public school system; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to conduct appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities to demonstrate support for charter schools during this weeklong celebration in communities throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 382 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the designation of May 3-May 9, 2009, as "National Charter Schools Week," and to recognize the growing charter school movement in our Nation.

The charter school movement is grounded in the concepts of community empowerment and parental involvement. The core idea behind charter schools is simple, yet powerful; seeking to serve the unique needs of all children, local communities, parents and educators come together to design, create, and manage schools that provide a high quality education through innovation, flexibility, autonomy, and a focus on results.

Sometimes people ask me, what is a charter school? A charter school is simply a governance model. It is site-based government, where the decisions of who runs the school and the curriculum are left up to the folks most directly involved with the outcome.

Charter schools date back to 1991, when Minnesota enacted the first char-

ter school legislation. California followed suit in 1992. My home State of Colorado soon joined the growing movement in 1993.

Since their inception, charter schools have grown by leaps and bounds to address the various needs of our Nation's public school students. Diverse charter schools across the country offer innovative instruction. With site-based control and flexibility, charter schools can make timely decisions about how to structure the school day, which curriculum best suits the needs of their students, and what type of staff and staff development will enrich their school community. Additionally, charter schools form important community partnerships with parents and businesses.

This week, charter schools across the country will celebrate the 10th annual National Charter Schools Week. This year's theme, "Promoting Innovation and Excellence," was inspired by President Obama. It celebrates and encourages charter schools to continue to share their successes as part of the effort to reform public education in our country.

As a former chairman of the Colorado State Board of Education and the founder and superintendent of a system of charter schools that empower new immigrants and English language learners to succeed and live the American Dream, I have seen firsthand how innovation in the education system can achieve remarkable results. I also co-founded a charter school serving youths who are homeless or in unstable living conditions, the Academy of Urban Learning.

I know how the power of educational opportunity can transform lives and serve the most at-risk youth. All of the entrepreneurial creativity around charter schools has been an important part of serving all Americans across our country.

Today, there are almost 4,700 charter schools operating in 40 States that have charter school legislation, as well as the District of Columbia. Their combined force serves over 1.4 million students, and 61 percent of charter schools report waiting lists. These waiting lists of nearly 365,000 students nationally are enough to fill over 1,100 new charter schools. To answer this growing need, between 300 and 400 new public charter schools open each year, and nearly 150,000 new students enroll in charter schools annually.

The growing charter school movement is providing opportunities for many historically underserved communities. Nationally, charter schools disproportionately serve minority and low-income students. In fact, 58 percent of charter school students are minorities and 52 percent qualify for free and reduced lunch. Many charter schools are able to achieve impressive academic results.

In the charter school that I ran, 85 percent of the students are English language learners. In Colorado, 78 percent

of our charters made Adequate Yearly Progress, or AYP, last year, and 55 percent of charters were rated excellent or high.

In the Second Congressional District of Colorado that I represent, over 14,000 students attend one of our 26 charter schools, and almost 8 out of 10 made Adequate Yearly Progress.

Peak-to-Peak Charter School in Lafayette was named by Newsweek the 40th best high school in the Nation, out of 27,000 public high schools—quite a distinction. It is the only school in Colorado to rank in the top 100. This follows Peak to Peak High School's recognition by U.S. News and World Report as a 2008 Gold Medal School, ranking 47th in the Nation, and one of only two Colorado schools to rank in the top 100.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my heartfelt support for National Charter Schools Week and encourage all social entrepreneurs and activists across the country to include charter schools in their efforts to improve the quality of education for young people and recognize the charter school's movement, a 17-year history of providing a quality public education option based on innovation, flexibility, and community partnerships.

I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 382, congratulating charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education.

This week has been designated as the 10th Annual Charter Schools Week. And it is entirely appropriate that we take a few minutes to recognize the contributions charter schools make every day in the lives of millions of children.

Charter schools are innovative public schools with a simple interest in providing a quality education to children in their community. They explore new educational approaches, such as longer school days or an extended school year, and are free from most rules and regulations governing conventional public schools.

Every day, however, charter schools face the unarguable facts of free market pressures. Unlike traditional public schools, charter schools must demonstrate the success of their students' academic achievements to parents, policymakers, and their communities or face closure. From the time the first charter school opened its door, they have risen to the challenge. For example, charter schools made an important contribution to rebuilding and strengthening Louisiana after Hurricanes Rita and Katrina, particularly in New Orleans.

More often than not, charter schools meet the student achievement and accountability requirements under No Child Left Behind and in the same manner as traditional public schools, but often set higher individual goals to ensure that they are of high quality and truly accountable to the public. Yet, despite these innovative approaches and promising reports of parental satisfaction, charter schools across the country have struggled through a myriad of obstacles to create such successful schools.

One such obstacle is State caps that limit growth. Twenty-six States and the District of Columbia have some type of limit or cap on charter school growth. Most caps restrict the number of charter schools allowed, while others restrict the number of students that a single school can serve. Caps on charter schools are often the consequence of political tradeoffs and not the result of agreement on sound education policy.

I am pleased that Congress has continued to support the public charter school programs authorized under No Child Left Behind. These programs provide support at key points in the development of charter schools, helping cover the extraordinary costs of launching successful charters, disseminating their successful innovations to other public schools, and providing financial incentives to State governments and private lenders that help enable schools to build and renovate facilities.

These programs have been a tremendous success, helping to create public charter schools all across the country that work to improve academic achievement for low-income students. It is my hope that the charter community will continue to build on its 16-year history of providing a high-quality option in public education that is based on innovation, freedom from red tape, and partnership between parents and educators, an option that is giving new hope to disadvantaged and minority families across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I would like to thank Congressman BISHOP, the sponsor of the legislation who is not able to be here today, for his sponsorship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. We need to call upon all the innovation of the American people to help meet the learning needs of all children. Charter schools provide one important avenue to do that. And it is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting National Charter School Week.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in support of H. Res. 382, "Supporting the goals and ideals of National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 3 through May 9, 2009". I would like to begin by thanking my colleague Representative BISHOP for introducing this resolution in the House, as quality education should be at the top of our priorities list. I urge my colleagues

to support and acknowledge charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our public school system.

Charter schools deliver high-quality education, challenge our students to reach their potential throughout the United States, and provide thousands of families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children. Charter schools improve their students' achievement and can stimulate improvement in traditional public schools as well. These unique, public schools are authorized by a designated public entity that are responding to the needs of our communities, families, and students and promoting the principles of quality, choice, and innovation.

Charter schools take a revolutionary approach in educating our nation's students. Today, roughly 4,700 charter schools are now serving approximately 1,400,000 children in 40 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico this year. Charter schools continually demonstrate their ongoing success to parents, policymakers, and their communities. Some charter schools even routinely measure parental satisfaction levels while all give parents new freedom to choose their public school.

Charter schools nationwide serve a higher percentage of low-income and minority students than the traditional public system and deliver higher quality education. Chartering is a radical educational innovation that is moving states beyond reforming existing schools to creating something entirely new. Chartering is at the center of a growing movement to challenge traditional notions of what public education means.

Charter schools have demonstrated their commitment to high academic standards, small class sizes, innovative approaches and educational philosophies. Many parents choose charter schools for their small size and associated safety as charter schools serve an average of 250 students.

I am pleased that over the last 15 years, Congress has provided substantial support to the charter school movement through startup financing assistance and grants for planning, implementation, and dissemination. In addition, these schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, Congress, State Governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the United States.

The intention of most charter school legislation is to: increase opportunities for learning and access to quality education for all students, create choice for parents and students within the public school system, provide a system of accountability for results in public education, encourage innovative teaching practices, create new professional opportunities for teachers, encourage community and parent involvement in public education, and leverage improved public education broadly. I believe Charter Schools and the Nations Public Schools can work side by side to educate the Nations Children!

Competition from charter schools has been shown to increase composite test scores in traditional district schools. Furthermore, twice as many registered voters favor charter schools as oppose I, them. The more people learn about charter schools, the more they like

them. Congress must lend its support to these schools and their goals, especially since on average, the funding gap between charter schools and traditional schools is 22 percent, or \$1,800 per pupil. The average charter school ends up with a total funding shortfall of nearly half a million dollars. Yet, twelve studies find that overall gains in charter schools are larger than other public schools; four find charter schools' gains higher in certain significant categories of schools and six find comparable gains to traditional schools. I ask my colleagues for their continued support of Charter schools and urge them to support this resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 382.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE MONTH

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 338) supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 338

Whereas there are more than 1,100 community colleges in the United States;

Whereas there are more than 11,000,000 students enrolled in for-credit and not-for-credit programs at community colleges nationwide;

Whereas in 2009, community colleges in the United States will award more than 500,000 associate's degrees and 270,000 associate's certificates;

Whereas community colleges have educated more than 100,000,000 people in the United States since the first community college was founded in 1901;

Whereas community college students are a more diverse group in terms of age, income, race, and ethnicity than students attending traditional colleges and universities, making community colleges essential to providing access to postsecondary education;

Whereas community colleges enrich and enhance communities across the country, socially, culturally, and politically;

Whereas community colleges are affordable and close to home for most people in the United States;

Whereas community colleges allow many older students to take courses part-time while working full-time, creating opportunities that otherwise would not be available;

Whereas community colleges provide job training for workers who have lost their jobs or are hoping to find better jobs, helping millions of people in the United States support themselves and their families;

Whereas community colleges contribute more than \$31,000,000,000 annually to the Nation's economic growth and, by helping to provide a skilled workforce, are critical to

our Nation's continued success and prosperity in the global economy of the 21st century; and

Whereas the American Association of Community Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, and more than 1,100 community colleges nationwide recognize April as National Community College Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Community College Month; and

(2) congratulates the Nation's community colleges, and their students, governing boards, faculty, and staff, for their contributions to education and workforce development, and for their vital role in ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 338 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 338, which supports the goals and ideals of National Community College Month. This resolution recognizes community colleges all across the country for their enormous contribution to educational outcomes and to workforce development.

Since the first community college, Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois, was founded in 1901, community colleges have educated more than 100 million students in the United States. Community colleges provide a variety of roles for students. It is a place to receive an associate's degree, to begin a bachelor's degree, or for workplace training.

With more than 1,100 community colleges in the United States and over 11 million students currently enrolled in these schools, community colleges provide a high-quality education and resources to students coming from widely diverse backgrounds.

Community colleges enroll a diverse student body. In 2000, the United States Department of Education reported that 31 percent of community college students were minorities, and 61 percent of community college students received Pell Grants and met the income thresholds to qualify.

Community colleges offer a number of advantages for students. The schools maintain affordable tuition at a time of increasing tuition costs. And for a majority of Americans, community colleges are located conveniently close to their homes. The close proximity allows working students to take courses part-time while keeping their employ-

ment. One community college in my district, Colorado Mountain College, has five campuses spread across the mountain areas to help ensure that they have presence close to the places of work and where people live.

More students are enrolled part-time in community colleges than full-time. Additionally, community colleges provide excellent job training to millions of Americans who have lost their jobs or who desire more lucrative opportunities. This is particularly critical in these tough economic times. It costs almost \$2,500 per year to attend a community college, while it costs over \$6,500 a year to attend a 4-year in-state college, on average.

It is vital that community colleges remain affordable to the millions of students who attend every year. Furthermore, community colleges are at the forefront of innovation. With more than \$100 billion included in the economic stimulus package for green job opportunities, community colleges are prepared to provide the type of training necessary to implement our new green investment and help make sure that the renewable energy sector is a strong growing sector with a workforce that is ready to take on the positions.

This year, community colleges in our country will award more than 500,000 associate degrees and 270 associate certificates. Countless other students in community colleges will continue their education and transfer to 4-year colleges and universities.

Community colleges help spur the economy and provide a skilled workforce to contribute more than \$31 billion to the Nation's economy each year. In Colorado's Second Congressional District that I have the honor to represent, Front Range Community College and the Colorado Mountain College are effectively addressing the needs of both students and families and employers, and represent an essential component for ongoing economic development as well as our community pride.

The American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of Community College Trustees, and community colleges across the country support this bill and this month. I urge my colleagues to support the bill as well and would like to thank Representative LATHAM for bringing this resolution forward, for community colleges are instrumental to our Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 338, supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College Month, and congratulating the community colleges for their role in educating the Nation.

As a co-chairman of the Congressional Community College Caucus and a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have witnessed the

benefits community colleges have to offer.

Community colleges serve a diverse body of students by providing them with a unique flexibility. Most community colleges offer evening courses that allow students to work towards earning their degree while working full-time to support themselves and their families. This flexibility allows many older working adults to further their education and advance their careers. In fact, the average age of a student attending community college is 29, and 50 percent of full-time students are employed part-time and 50 percent of part-time students are employed full-time.

Community colleges' flexibility also enables students whose cultural traditions may encourage them to fulfill more traditional familial roles and may not encourage them to take 4 years to attend a traditional college or university to pursue higher education or job training while fulfilling familial duties. The flexibility of most community colleges helps to draw in a diverse student body, and the relatively low cost of most community colleges provides an educational opportunity to many students who otherwise could not afford to further their education or careers.

The average cost of attendance at a community colleges is \$2,402 per year. This is significantly less than the average annual cost of attending a 4-year public or private university or college at \$6,585 for in-state, and \$17,452 for out-of-state tuition and fees at a public institution, and \$25,143, for tuition and fees at a private institution.

Community colleges provide a diverse body of students from various income levels with an opportunity for education. Students may be working toward a 2- or 4-year degree, a professional certification, or furthering their careers through job training, learning a second language, or attending employer-recommended classes in order to receive a promotion. Community colleges award approximately 555,000 associates degrees and approximately 295,000 professional certificates annually. In addition, many community colleges work closely with their community's one-stop employment center to provide skills, training, and other services to unemployed or dislocated workers, which is especially important in these difficult economic times.

Community colleges provide innumerable education opportunities to people of all ages, professions, cultures, and stages of life. These institutions enroll an estimated 11.5 million people annually, and open the door to education for people who would otherwise be unable to pursue it.

This is why I stand in support of this resolution, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, like Mr. CASTLE, I am one of the co-Chairs of the House Community College Caucus. And I am also pleased to join today in honoring our Nation's community colleges.

Community colleges provide an affordable close-to-home education to between 11 and 12 million Americans every year. Community colleges create opportunities for Americans that they just otherwise would not have available to them.

GEDs: for those students who do not complete high school in the regular time, in my State at least, the great, great majority of students who go back to get a GED go back to community colleges to get it. Sometimes the training is done on campus; sometimes it is done at work sites. But the great majority of students who do get their GED—which is an absolute requirement to having any prospect of getting highly skilled, well-paid jobs, they get that training through GEDs.

A great many students spend their first 2 years in college at community colleges before going on to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

Community colleges train for jobs in a way that really makes jobs available to students. They are important for employers, and they are important for workers. No employer is going to move into a city, is going to expand operations or begin new operations in a community that does not offer the kind of job training that a community college offers.

All manner of job skills are taught at community colleges and really do the bulk of the Nation's work in providing training for those skills: health care professionals, nurses, phlebotomists, x-ray technicians, on and on. The bulk of those students—in North Carolina, at least, and I suspect in much of the Nation—are at community colleges.

Building trades: all of the skills in building trades are taught at community colleges. Law enforcement, fire fighting, other first responders go to community colleges for the skills they need. And in North Carolina, at least, where we are blessed with one of the first and best community college systems, there are programs, curricula in communities that are precisely tailored to specific needs of that community.

Let me give just a couple of examples. In the county I live in, Wake County, North Carolina, which includes Raleigh, the eastern end of the county, the towns of Zebulon, Knightdale and Wendell, is an area that includes—along with counties just east of there—a cluster of 30 or 40 employers that use extrusion technology for various reasons. Extrusion is pulling on plastics like taffy to shape it. And Wake Technical Community College established a campus in that part of the county specifically to train skills used in the extrusion industries.

In Alamance County, which for 100 years has been dominated by the tex-

tile industry, but the textile industry has taken one hit after another, a small company has grown up now, LabCorp, to become the Nation's second largest medical testing firm. Samples are sent from all over the country to be tested at LabCorp in Burlington, Alamance County. One of the leading programs or curricula at the Alamance Community College is a biotech program. And they have a standing understanding, agreement with LabCorp, that LabCorp will hire everybody who comes out of that program who wants to work for LabCorp.

□ 1345

The list goes on and on. Community colleges really are where our workers are going to need to go to improve their job skills to make sure that our Nation remains the most productive nation on Earth. And if we are going to have the most prosperous economy in the world, we need to have the most productive workers in the world, and community colleges are making that happen.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again I would like to express my appreciation for the work done by community colleges across our country and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 338.

America's community colleges continue to provide a silver lining to accompany the dark clouds of economic uncertainty.

Community colleges are uniquely positioned to retrain displaced workers so they can get back into the workforce and start earning a paycheck, even as unemployment figures across the country continue to climb. They help breathe life into local economies by giving workers the expertise they need to excel in the job market.

At this very moment, our future nurses, technicians and manufacturers are gaining the experience and expertise they need to compete in the marketplace through programs offered by community colleges.

These jobs are the backbone of our economy and a central support for millions of American families. They pay well and they come with reliable benefits. And they become even more important during a time of economic uncertainty.

In Iowa—my home state—community colleges have partnered with government agencies to organize job fairs that put workers in contact with potential employers and boost the profile of local businesses. Iowa's community colleges are strengthening the state's business climate. They're laying a foundation that will meet the needs of an increasingly competitive and high-tech workforce well into the future.

Community colleges have also taken great strides in renewable energy through groundbreaking programs that provide students with hands-on experience with the latest equipment. Graduates of these programs go to work on high-tech windmills and other innovative technology.

These are truly the jobs of the future, and I'm proud that several community colleges in

Iowa are leading the way. These programs are laying the foundation for a new era of energy efficiency and environmental responsibility that will benefit everyone in America.

Community colleges provide a wealth of benefits to the people they serve. They improve the quality of life in their communities. They prepare workers for the job market, and they are often laboratories of innovation. Our communities rely on the economic spark they provide—especially in the midst of hard times.

It's imperative that we provide these institutions the resources they need to continue their mission. Community colleges have proven that they get results. They improve lives. They strengthen communities.

I have the utmost confidence in the hard work and resiliency of the American people. Without doubt, we will recover from this economic downturn. And I'm just as certain that our community colleges will help us get there.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 338, "Supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College Month". I would like to thank my colleague Representative TOM LATHAM for introducing this resolution, as well as the co-sponsors.

The American Association of Community Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, and hundreds of community colleges nationwide recognize April as National Community College Month. They have many achievements to celebrate.

There are over 1100 community colleges in our nation, enrolling over 11 million students nationwide. Since the first community college was founded in the United States, over a century ago, community colleges have educated more than 100 million American minds, making incalculable contributions to our country and population. To this day, they contribute more than \$31 billion annually to the Nation's economic growth and, by helping to provide a skilled workforce, are critical to our Nation's continued success and prosperity in the global economy of the 21st century.

I know about this from the achievements of my district, and the work done by among the finest of academic institutions—Houston Community College. Founded in 1971, under the wing of the Houston Independent School District—for example, initially using the district's campuses to teach night classes. In 1997 they began to transfer operations to community college district-operated campuses throughout the college's service area.

Today, they offer students a wide array of academic and work programs, from accounting to fine arts, as well as stimulating programs such as the Spring Branch Business Plan Competition—learning and career opportunities found across the city of Houston and the surrounding area, in six different colleges.

Perhaps, most notably, the Houston Community College System operates a television channel called HCCTV, which stands for Houston Community College Television, which began in 1994. It is aired on a number of local cable channels and streamed on the Internet, operating with a studio complex, which has one large studio unit, five edit suites, and a digital master control system, all of which are located at the HCC headquarters. Just this past Saturday, I attended HCC's graduation in Houston. It was a tribute to how community colleges can change lives.

This is only one community college. In 2009, community colleges in the United States

will award, to these young minds, more than 500,000 associate's degrees and 270,000 associate's certificates. The students are a more diverse group in terms of age, income, race, and ethnicity than students attending traditional colleges and universities, making community colleges essential to providing access to postsecondary education.

They allow many older students to take courses part-time while working full-time, creating opportunities that otherwise would not be available and are affordable and close to home for most people in the United States. Community colleges provide job training for workers who have lost their jobs or are hoping to find better jobs, helping millions of people in the United States support themselves and their families.

I am here before you today supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College Month, and urging my fellow members to do the same. Let us, as a Congress, and as a country, congratulate the Nation's community colleges, and their students, governing boards, faculty, and staff, for their contributions to education and workforce development, and for their vital role in ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the Nation.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank Congressman LATHAM and my colleagues, for introducing H. Res. 338 honoring community colleges. I have long supported these institutions for the professional education they provide their students and I am happy to honor them today.

Community colleges in New Jersey serve over 150,000 students at 19 campuses.

They offer their students a broad array of certificate and associate degree programs—from business management to nursing, and engineering to philosophy.

That is why, as Assembly Speaker in New Jersey, I created the STARS program that allowed star high school students to attend any community college in New Jersey for free. Now that program has been expanded to allow these students to attend a four-year college after two high-performing years at their community college. I recognized the great education these institutions provide to students and I wanted to ensure that they remained a viable option for future students.

Community colleges play a vital role in our communities and for the students who attend them. I am proud to show my support for these fine institutions and H. Res. 338.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to celebrate April as National Community College Month with my support of H. Res. 338, "Supporting the Goals and Ideals of National Community College."

As the largest rural college district in the state, Cochise College has served the area of Southeastern Arizona since 1964. With multiple campuses and learning centers in Douglas, Sierra Vista, Benson, Willcox, Fort Huachuca, and Nogales, Cochise educates about 14,000 students a year.

Community colleges are essential to expanding access to postsecondary education to those who might not normally benefit from traditional colleges and universities. As a member of the Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges consortium, Cochise College offers tailored learning to active-duty or retired servicemembers and their families.

Furthermore, community colleges contribute over \$31 billion annually to the Nation's eco-

nomie growth. In Cochise County, the College is the 10th largest employer in the county.

Cochise College strives to educate students with transferable degrees and direct-employment training, which are important tools in a competitive job market such as this. As South-eastern Arizona continues to grow, the College's role becomes ever so important to our community's development.

I am proud to celebrate National Community College Month by recognizing the integral role community colleges play in our evolving society.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to celebrate April as National Community College Month with my support of H. Res. 338, "Supporting the Goals and Ideals of National Community College Month."

More than 11 million students are enrolled in for-credit and not-for-credit programs at community colleges nationwide, and in my district alone, over 73,000 students attend Pima Community College in Tucson, Arizona.

Community colleges are essential to expanding access to postsecondary education to a more diverse population than traditional colleges and universities. Pima Community College exemplifies that mission with a student profile compiled of 56% women and 42% ethnic minorities.

Since 1969, Pima Community College has provided an affordable and convenient education by offering child care, job placement assistance, financial aid, and other support services. As University fees continue to rise and more people return to school in an increasingly competitive job market, the College's role becomes ever so important to our community's development.

I am proud to celebrate National Community College Month by recognizing the integral role community colleges play in our evolving society.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 338.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL CHAMPION UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 348) congratulating the University of North Carolina men's basketball team for winning the 2009 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball National Championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 348

Whereas, on April 6, 2009, the University of North Carolina Tar Heels defeated the Michigan State University Spartans 89–72 in the finals of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Men's Basketball Tournament in Detroit, Michigan;

Whereas the Tar Heels now hold 6 men's basketball national titles, including 5 NCAA tournament titles, tied for the third most in NCAA history;

Whereas the Tar Heels have won men's basketball national championships in 1924, 1957, 1982, 1993, 2005, and 2009 and have played in a record 18 "Final Fours";

Whereas Tar Heels head coach and Asheville, North Carolina, native Roy Williams won his second NCAA title in his sixth year coaching the team, improving to 594–138 in 21 seasons as a head coach, and has the highest winning percentage of any active coach in men's basketball;

Whereas Coach Williams and his coaching staff, including Assistant Coaches Joe Holladay, Steve Robinson, and C.B. McGrath, as well as each trainer, manager, and staff member, deserve praise and credit for their outstanding dedication to helping the North Carolina Tar Heels reach the summit of college basketball;

Whereas Tar Heel seniors Tyler Hansbrough, Danny Green, Mike Copeland, Bobby Frasier, Marcus Ginyard, Patrick Moody, J.B. Tanner, and Jack Wooten celebrated 4 years at North Carolina with a National Championship, and became the winningest class in the 99-year history of the University of North Carolina men's basketball program;

Whereas Tar Heel junior Wayne Ellington was named Most Outstanding Player of the tournament, averaging 19.2 points per game;

Whereas Tar Heel junior Ty Lawson and senior Tyler Hansbrough joined Wayne Ellington on the all-tournament team, along with Spartans players Kalin Lucas and Goran Suton;

Whereas the roster of the North Carolina Tar Heels also included juniors Marc Campbell and Deon Thompson; sophomore Will Graves; and freshmen Ed Davis, Larry Drew II, Justin Watts, and Tyler Zeller;

Whereas the Tar Heels set a record for the most points in one half of a Championship game with 55, and Tar Heel point guard Ty Lawson set a record for the most steals in a Championship game with 8;

Whereas the North Carolina Tar Heels finished the 2008–2009 season with 34 wins and 4 losses, completing their third consecutive 30 win season;

Whereas the Tar Heels won their second National Championship in 5 years;

Whereas the Tar Heel players, coaches, and staff are outstanding representatives of the University of North Carolina, the oldest public university in the country and a distinguished leader in higher education that is consistently ranked among the Nation's top universities in academic performance;

Whereas the Tar Heels showed tremendous dedication to their team, appreciation to their fans, sportsmanship toward their opponents, and respect for the game of basketball throughout the 2009 season, maintaining the tradition of excellence established by legendary coach Dean Smith; and

Whereas residents of the Old North State and North Carolina fans worldwide are to be congratulated for their long-standing support, perseverance, and pride in the team: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the national champion North Carolina Tar Heels for their historic win in the 2009 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Basketball Championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, and support staff who were instrumental in helping the University of North Carolina Tar Heels win the tournament; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to University of North Carolina Chancellor Holden Thorp, Athletic Director Dick Baddour, and Head Coach Roy Williams for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 348 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 348, congratulating the University of North Carolina men's basketball team for winning the 2009 NCAA Division I National Championship. I am pleased to have the support of the entire North Carolina delegation as original cosponsors of this resolution.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is a special place to the entire State of North Carolina and, as the Nation's first public university, has long been a beacon of light and liberty in the South. The academic tradition of excellence and unyielding commitment to public service is what drew me across the mountains from Tennessee to Chapel Hill 50 years ago and largely shaped my life's further course.

This year's success caps a remarkable history. UNC has played in a record 18 Final Fours and won the NCAA National Championship in 1957, 1982, 1993, 2005, and 2009.

While Head Coach Roy Williams inherited a first-class program, he deserves special credit for the exceptional success and character of his teams. Coach Williams, who is a native of the mountains of North Carolina, has the highest winning percentage of any active coach in men's basketball, and unquestionably sits at the top of

his profession. Since he came to Carolina as head coach in 2003, the Tar Heels have won two NCAA championships, four Atlantic Coast Conference regular season championships, and two ACC tournament championships. The 2008–2009 season marks their third consecutive 30-win season.

Like the whole community of Carolina basketball fans, I'm exceedingly proud of this entire team—the players, the coaches, and the staff—for their outstanding performance in the Nation's most competitive and most watched college athletics tournament. In addition to their on-court success, the team has consistently shown academic commitment, appreciation to their fans, good sportsmanship toward their opponents, and respect for the game of basketball. I'm particularly proud that Inside Higher Education also crowned UNC its national champion in its annual academic NCAA tournament, signifying that UNC has the single best academic performance rate of any NCAA tournament team. These coaches and players have ably upheld the tradition of excellence—both on the court and in the classroom—established by legendary coaches Dean Smith and Bill Guthridge and now continued by Roy Williams.

As an alumnus and Chapel Hill resident, this program and most recent championship make me very proud. These are my friends and neighbors—Joan Ewing, my dear friend and former district director, is Dean Smith's sister—and it is my honor to represent all of them in Congress.

But this year other alumni and I were not the only fans in Washington cheering the Tar Heels from afar. President Obama himself picked Carolina to bring home the title and played a pickup game with the team last spring before the North Carolina primary election. It's important to note that he did so while employing a former Duke basketball player as his closest personal aide. As the Member of this institution who represents both institutions and a Carolina alumnus who teaches at Duke, I can only salute such a feat of athletic bipartisanship with great admiration! It's very reassuring to have this display coming from our new President.

So, colleagues, I urge the House to join President Obama and the North Carolina delegation in celebrating the Tar Heels. This is an institution and team who are worthy of our praise; not only because they found success, but because they did it the right way, the Carolina way.

Hark the sound and go Heels.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to congratulate the University of North Carolina Tar Heels. I don't have the same level of connection with North Carolina as does Mr. PRICE, but I did pick them in my basketball pool, which I didn't win, by the way, but at least I won on that aspect of it; so I congratulate them for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. LATHAM. He, too, will congratulate North Carolina, but he wants to comment on the previous bill, which, unfortunately, he couldn't quite get here for, on community colleges.

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina on his resolution and congratulate the Tar Heels, and I rise in support of his resolution.

I was detained a few moments ago on the previous resolution here. I had a group of very bright, young eighth graders from Garner-Hayfield, Iowa, on the east steps out here. But the previously discussed resolution was mine, honoring the National Community College Month, and I just want to make sure in the RECORD that it reflects how important I believe our community colleges are as far as economic growth and prosperity for the future and how important a role that they play as far as giving individuals in this difficult economy the opportunity to be successful, to have real careers.

The community colleges today are where the rubber meets the road. I'm very proud to be co-chairman of the Community College Caucus, and I just want to introduce my formal statement into the RECORD. But I did want to come to the floor to congratulate my good friend from North Carolina but also to speak to the National Community College Month.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, another UNC alumnus, BRAD MILLER of the 13th District of North Carolina.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague DAVID PRICE to speak in favor, to take the pro side of this debate.

I am a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I spoke a moment ago about the importance of community colleges in creating opportunities for people who otherwise would not have them. That is emphatically true for me and, for the University of North Carolina, the role it has played in my life. I could not be a Member of this body if it were not for the opportunities that the University of North Carolina, my State university, created for me and creates for thousands of middle class kids from North Carolina, kids from the middle class, people who are from families that are struggling to get into the middle class.

I do trust my friend and colleague of longstanding from North Carolina, DAVID PRICE, also a graduate of the University of North Carolina. I know that he also has been a professor at a nearby institution of lesser reputation, so I wanted to make sure there was

someone here with absolutely unmixed loyalties who could speak in favor of this resolution.

The men's basketball team this year was an exceptional group of athletes. The starting five, Tyler Hansbrough, Deon Thompson, Ty Lawson, Wayne Ellington, Danny Green, others coming off the bench, Bobby Frasor, Ed Davis, Tyler Zeller, others, was an extraordinary group of athletes. There was no doubt that they would be at the Final Four in the mix for the title throughout the season.

Mr. PRICE has already mentioned the frequency with which my university has won the national championship, but it bears repeating: 1957, 1982, 1993, 2005, and 2009 the University of North Carolina has won the championship. But beyond just that accomplishment, that athletic accomplishment, we have done it with a basketball program that we can be proud of. Our academic standards have remained high. Our graduation rate for our basketball players, for our athletes is exceptionally high. Dean Smith, a revered figure in college athletics, in addition to being the coach of the men's basketball team for many years, in the 1960s when it was not such an easy thing to do, led with one of the leaders of the fight for racial justice in North Carolina, something that I think all North Carolina graduates can be proud of.

I am proud that we have those banners hanging in the rafters that I mentioned, 1957, 1992, 1993, 2005, and 2009, but I'm even more proud of knowing that we will never have to take those banners down. We will never hear from the NCAA that we have violated the rules so flagrantly that we have to give our banners back.

I am proud of this year's team. I'm proud of our men's basketball program. I'm proud of my university. And I urge all Members to vote for this resolution.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thought somebody who's not from North Carolina should say something nice about North Carolina basketball in North Carolina, and I have a full statement, which I will submit.

But I just want to congratulate the team and the university. And it's happened a lot before. We all know the excellence of North Carolina basketball. This is their sixth national title. Roy Williams has won twice now in his 6th year in coaching the team, improving to 594 wins and 138 losses in 21 seasons as a head coach, which gives him the highest winning percentage of any active coach in men's basketball. The individual players who are graduating this year excelled, obviously, and they deserve a tremendous amount of credit. Junior Wayne Ellington was the Most Outstanding Player. He, too, deserves a great deal of credit.

And to our friends from North Carolina, I also recognize the academics of the institution and the great work which they have done not only for the State of North Carolina but other

States such as my State of Delaware and other places that the North Carolina graduates have gone. North Carolina is in its third century. It has 71 bachelor's, 107 master's, 74 doctorate, and four professional degree programs, and they're all very important for the future of North Carolina and for America.

So we offer our congratulations to the entire University of North Carolina, to their athletic department as well as the basketball team, and obviously the academic school for all the great work which they have done. They are a shining example for the rest of us in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from the Seventh District of North Carolina and yet another UNC alumnus, MIKE MCINTYRE.

(Mr. MCINTYRE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 348, a resolution congratulating my alma mater, University of North Carolina, men's basketball team for winning the 2009 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball National Championship.

I can tell you as an undergraduate, who was in the class of Phil Ford, as many of our friends will remember, who had the famous four-corners offense under Coach Dean Smith and as one who also went to law school at University of North Carolina when Sam Perkins and several other fellows, James Worthy and Matt Doherty, were all involved in the program, we saw some great years of basketball and Final Fours. And throughout, I know my life and the lives of many of us who have gone to the University of North Carolina, folks from all over—not just the State—but the Nation indeed, we take great pride in the winning tradition that we all have personally witnessed throughout the years by the University of North Carolina basketball team.

In fact, both of my sons, Stephen and Joshua McIntyre, are now in law school at Carolina and were undergraduates when Carolina won its first title under Roy Williams just a few years ago in St. Louis, when we were there to watch the March to the Arch. And I had the great pleasure to be in Detroit for the Final Four to witness Carolina win this championship by our great coach, Roy Williams, his wonderful assistants and, of course, the great players for the Carolina team.

The precedent that has been set by Dean Smith, the great tradition that he had, the wonderful work that Coach Roy Williams clearly has done, sends a strong message that success can be found through dedication and hard work. In fact, I would say that they

have shown that despite all difficulties this team faced when they were chosen as preseason number one, and everybody expected them to win the championship—but then they went through difficult times—but then they came back and proved that, indeed, they were the national champions. It showed that the three Ds in the real world, dreams, dedication and determination, lead to success such as this Tar Heel team found in winning the national championship.

Having a dream, being dedicated to it as those players worked and worked, despite the difficulty, the coaching staff worked, the managers that supported the team, and then they came together through that dedication to that dream, they were determined to prove they, indeed, were the number one team in the Nation. That they did in Detroit.

I cannot say enough about the great program that this is in terms of what it exemplifies in terms of the values of teamwork, commitment, loyalty, courage and being able to stand up against adversity. It sends a strong message of success that others can emulate in other programs around this country; and it speaks to young people everywhere. Five NCAA championships for the University of North Carolina, plus the championship, a national championship prior to when the NCAA was formed. So, really, six national championships have been won now by the men's basketball team.

On behalf of the United States Congress, let me join my colleagues in saying, and as a proud fellow alumnus of the University of North Carolina and as one who has family members attending the University of North Carolina now, we are very proud of our Tar Heels. The citizens of North Carolina and the United States Congress are proud of the exemplary role that they have played in college sports and the example they have set for our Nation. God bless the Tar Heel boys.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I had yielded back the balance of my time, but the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has arrived and would like 2 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent to yield him 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. Before he starts, I am just surprised that the gentleman from North Carolina didn't object to somebody representing Kentucky basketball speaking, but Mr. ROGERS is a distinguished gentleman.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. CASTLE, for yielding me this time.

I couldn't let this opportunity pass without congratulating the University of North Carolina, the Tar Heels, and my friend and colleague, Mr. PRICE, for

offering this resolution, and I strongly support it.

As an alumnus of the University of Kentucky, a frequent rival of the Tar Heels on the basketball court and a frequent national champion itself, we recognize that excellence of the North Carolina basketball program and its great coach, who has distinguished himself in so many different ways.

So from the SEC, we want to congratulate the ACC and particularly the University of North Carolina for the great season and the great seasons that that school has had.

I resided in Franklin, North Carolina, back in 1957, 1958, working at a radio station in Franklin, and that was the time when the State was developing the Research Triangle, which has been a sterling program for the Nation and the home of these great universities that populate that part of North Carolina and what a great amount of progress the State has made in those years.

So I count myself a great admirer of the State of North Carolina and especially of this basketball program, which has meant so much to the young people going through that great university. It exemplifies, I think, the excellence of that system, that school.

So I stand here, from the University of Kentucky, and we have had our knocks the past few years; but watch out, we're coming back.

I want to congratulate DAVID and all the Carolinians who are supporting this resolution and add one more voice, this time from the SEC, in congratulations to UNC.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Kentucky, knowing him and how much he knows and cares about basketball and knowing about that Kentucky tradition. Those words really mean a great deal coming from him. I think we are all grateful.

Now I yield 3 minutes to yet another Carolina Representative from the Second Congressional District, BOB ETHERIDGE.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank my colleague from the Fourth District for yielding. He has the great privilege, my colleague from Kentucky, he has the great privilege of representing an outstanding university in academics and research and now a school that has added to their joy with another national championship. But as my colleague from Kentucky said, I think all of us need to keep it in perspective.

We are awful proud of the Tar Heels because they showed what, really, athletics are about: tenacity, having a commitment for excellence and strong academics. UNC is one of those institutions that anchors the corner through the Research Triangle, one of the fine research universities in this country and one of the regions that employs an awful lot of our people.

So we are awful proud of the young men who come to North Carolina, who have added to the reputation of that

great UNC institution in bringing home a national championship.

I think for people who have played basketball, you can really appreciate what it takes, the pressures that are on those young men anywhere from 18 to 21 years of age, tremendous pressure over a full season and in several weeks leading to a championship where every game is a championship game. All you have to do is lose one game and you are out.

I don't know of any greater pressure that a young person can have, and yet they showed the kind of class, the kind of strength, tremendous will. A lot of congratulations go to the coach, to the university and especially to those young men.

Let me thank my colleague for bringing this resolution forward. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution and congratulating an outstanding group of young men from all over the country who came to North Carolina to go to school, to get an education and play a sport that allowed them to get an education.

I think folks begin to forget sometimes what we are talking about are student athletes. They are students first and then athletes. I thank you for doing this resolution. I am proud to have an opportunity to join him in congratulating these young men and the alums for that.

I would close by saying that my daughter had our first grandson, she was a graduate, undergraduate, graduate school and law school, and the first thing she taught him to say was "Go Heels." She didn't even get him to say, "I am glad to see you, Granddaddy." It was "Go Heels."

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge everybody to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague. As you might guess, from what he said and the way he looks, he knows whereof he speaks when he talks about playing basketball at the collegiate level.

So we are grateful for these words of support and commend this resolution to all of our colleagues.

I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 348.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SUPPORTING GLOBAL YOUTH SERVICE DAYS

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 353) supporting the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Days.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 353

Whereas Global Youth Service Days is an annual public awareness and education campaign that highlights the valuable contributions that young people make to their communities year-round;

Whereas the goals of Global Youth Service Days are to—

(1) mobilize the youth of the United States to identify and address the needs of their communities through community service and service-learning opportunities;

(2) support young people in embarking on a lifelong path of volunteer service and civic engagement; and

(3) educate the public, the media, and policymakers about contributions made by young people as community leaders throughout the year;

Whereas Global Youth Service Days, a program of Youth Service America, is the largest service event in the world and in 2009 is being observed for the 21st consecutive year in the United States and for the 10th year in more than 100 countries;

Whereas young people in the United States and in many other countries are providing more volunteer service to their communities than in any other generation in history, thereby demonstrating that children and youth not only represent the future of the world, but are also leaders and assets today;

Whereas recent research shows that high quality, semester-long service-learning, when used as a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with academic curriculum, increases students' cognitive engagement, motivation to learn, school attendance, and academic achievement scores;

Whereas a fundamental and conclusive correlation exists between youth service, character development, lifelong adult volunteering, philanthropy, and other forms of civic engagement;

Whereas community service and service-learning provide opportunities for youth to apply their knowledge, idealism, energy, creativity, and unique perspectives to improve local communities by addressing critical issues such as poverty, hunger, illiteracy, education, natural disasters, climate change, and many others;

Whereas a growing number of Global Youth Service Days projects involve youth working collaboratively across national boundaries to address global issues, to increase intercultural understanding, and to promote the sense that they are global citizens;

Whereas Global Youth Service Day engages millions of young people worldwide with the support of 50 International Coordinating Committee member organizations, over 150 U.S. National Partners, 75 local and statewide Global Youth Services Days lead agencies, and thousands of local organizers; and

Whereas both young people and their communities will benefit greatly from expanded opportunities for youth to engage in volun-

teer community service and service-learning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and commends the significant contributions of youth of the United States and encourages the cultivation of a civic bond between young people dedicated to serving their neighbors, their communities, and the Nation;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Days 2009; and

(3) calls on the citizens of the United States to—

(A) observe the day by encouraging youth to participate community service and service-learning projects and by joining them in such projects;

(B) recognize the volunteer efforts of the young people of the United States throughout the year; and

(C) support the volunteer efforts of young people and engage them in meaningful community service, service-learning, and decision-making opportunities today as an investment in the future of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and insert extraneous materials on H. Res. 353 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 353, a resolution to support the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Days.

Global Youth Service Days is an annual global event that highlights and celebrates the ongoing contributions of youth to their communities through volunteer service and service learning. Just last month, President Obama signed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which reauthorized programs that support national and community service, including the goal of tripling the number of youth volunteers in our communities.

Service learning extends the classroom into the community. It provides young people with the opportunity to give back locally, as well as offer real-life applications to prepare them for their lives.

Global Youth Service Days takes that one step further by promoting projects that encourage youth to work collaboratively across national boundaries to address global issues, to increase intercultural understanding and to promote the sense that they are global citizens.

Global Youth Service Days is the largest service event in the world, and in 2009 it's being observed for the 21st consecutive year in the United States, as well as for the 10th year in more

than 100 countries. Over the past 21 years, Global Youth Service Days has brought together more than 40 million people in thousands of communities worldwide.

The benefits of service for young people are countless. High quality semester-long service learning, when used as a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with academic curriculum, increases students' cognitive engagement, motivation to learn, school attendance and academic achievement.

Opportunities like Global Youth Service Day provide avenues for youth to apply their knowledge, idealism, energy, creativity and unique perspectives to improve local communities by addressing critical issues such as poverty, hunger, illiteracy, education, natural disasters, climate change and more. Past Global Youth Service Days have taken place in the United States as well as around the world.

In Colorado's Second Congressional District that I have the honor to represent, the weekend before last I celebrated Global Youth Service Days with Project YES in Lafayette, which hosted one of 75 major worldwide events and joined over 600 volunteers, who helped out Boulder County organizations such as the Emergency Family Assistance Association, Kids' Park in Lafayette, Sister Carmen Community Center and several local schools. I was thrilled to see the motivation and excitement that these young people had for improving our communities.

Young people and teachers in Tarija, Bolivia, addressed the public health issues surrounding unsanitary drinking water. Young people and teachers in Kuchinarai, Thailand, engaged 55 children who were orphaned by AIDS in a week-long summer camp focused on education, life skills, leadership, and self-esteem.

Both young people and their communities benefit greatly from expanded opportunities for youth to engage in community service and service learning.

Madam Speaker, this resolution serves to recognize and commend the significant contributions of the youth of the United States and to support the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Days 2009 internationally.

I would like to thank Representative DELAUNO for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. CASTLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 353, a Resolution Supporting the Goals and Ideals of Global Youth Service Days. Organized by Youth Service America, the National Youth Leadership Council, and Global Youth Action Network, and sponsored in the United States by the State Farm Companies Foundation, Global Youth Services

Day provides young people with an important opportunity to serve their local communities around the world.

Held every year during one weekend in April, over 100 countries participate in Global Youth Service Days. This year, young people from around the world rolled up their sleeves and partnered with various nonprofits and faith-based organizations to dedicate their time during the weekend of April 24 through April 26. Some past events include the following projects:

In Corona, California, youth studied and delivered reports on local areas' disaster preparedness. These reports led to an event dedicated to raising public awareness about homelessness and natural disasters.

Here in Washington, D.C., youth from various faith-based communities partnered with Habitat for Humanity to help with housing needs in Northeast D.C. and worked on a shoreline cleanup along the Anacostia River.

In Bolivia, with the help of a Disney Minnie Grant, youth were trained as public health educators to facilitate workshops to educate the community on public health issues surrounding unsanitary drinking water.

In Zimbabwe, youth volunteers refurbished 35 rural schools, worked to clean up parts of one of the cities in the country, and conducted an HIV/AIDS awareness campaign.

Introducing our young people to true volunteerism will help build a sense of civic duty early in their lives, which will lead them to become more civic-minded citizens, citizens who will continue to donate their time and skills to their local communities in the future as they get older. For that reason, I rise in support of House Resolution 353 and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 4 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this Resolution Honoring and Supporting the Goals and Ideals of Global Youth Service Days, held earlier this spring from April 24 through 26. With this resolution, we recognize the contributions that young people make to their communities and our Nation and across the globe.

For generations, during times of great crisis and need throughout our Nation, Americans have stepped up and served their country and their communities. Today, with soaring unemployment, stagnant wages, rising health care costs, and the financial market in crisis, this is one of those moments. To confront its dire challenges, we have an urgent responsibility to act, but no one person or single solution will fix this crisis alone. If we are serious about getting our Nation back on track, we must give everyone the opportunity to do their part, especially young people, our next generation of leaders.

Global Youth Service Day is a public awareness and education campaign led

by Youth Service America, with the National Youth Leadership Council and the Global Youth Action Network, highlighting the valuable contributions that young people make to their communities all year long.

The goals of Global Youth Service Day are to mobilize youth as leaders in identifying and addressing the needs of their communities, to support youth in community service and civic engagement, and to educate the public, the media, and the policymakers about the year-round contributions of young people to their communities.

On the weekend of April 24-26, young people across the United States and around the world designed and carried out community service and service learning projects in areas ranging from literacy and mentoring, to the environment and energy conservation, to hunger and homelessness; 75 local and statewide Lead Agencies, 150 national partners, 50 international organizations crossing old boundaries, building new partnerships.

In addition to the tangible and positive results these projects have on our communities, research shows that sustained participation in community service and service learning leads to increased levels of academic achievement and increased civic engagement among our youth.

Last month, President Obama signed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, expanded AmeriCorps, changing the face of national service as we know it. I am proud that a number of the initiatives I introduced to engage middle school students in service were included in the bill and enacted into law.

Ultimately, it is all about the asking. People want to be asked to serve, and it is already paying off at a time when more Americans than ever are ready to help those left vulnerable by this devastating economic downturn. In the past 5 months, the Corporation for National Service has received 48,000 online applications, up 234 percent over the 14,000 applications it received during the same 5-month period a year ago.

Shirley Chisholm said that, "Service is the rent that you pay for room on this Earth," and that is true no matter what your age or place in this world.

This is a transformational moment in our history. And so today, with efforts like Global Youth Service Day and amazing opportunities like it every day around the world, we hope to mark a new beginning, ready to meet the responsibility again to the greater good and to our shared community.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I would encourage everyone to support the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr.

POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 353.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT MERCED GRADUATING CLASS

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 396) honoring the graduating Class of 2009 at the University of California, Merced, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 396

Whereas the University of California system has become one of the largest and most highly acclaimed institutions of higher learning in the world;

Whereas Founding Chancellor Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, countless individuals, numerous elected officials, and an exceptional team of talented academic and administrative professionals shared a vision and drive to carry forward the University of California's historic mission of excellence in teaching, research, and public service by assembling to build the Nation's first major public research university of the 21st century in Merced, California;

Whereas half of UC Merced's students are the first in their families to attend college;

Whereas UC Merced celebrates having one of the most ethnically diverse research campuses in the Nation;

Whereas UC Merced increases educational access and opportunities for San Joaquin Valley students and will contribute to enhanced job opportunities, new business development, and economic growth throughout Central California;

Whereas 518 students will comprise the first-ever graduating class from UC Merced on May 16, 2009;

Whereas First Lady Michelle Obama will honor UC Merced's first graduating class by delivering the commencement speech; and

Whereas the class of 2009 helped establish a thriving campus and leave UC Merced highly qualified and ready to make deep and lasting marks in their communities as leaders of the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends the students comprising the first graduating class at the University of California, Merced, the class of 2009, for their

pioneering spirit, dedication, efforts, and desire to help establish an institution that puts Merced on the road to opportunity and promises to inspire the educational dreams of young people in this underserved region for generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 396 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 396, which commends the students of the very first graduating class of the University of California, Merced. UC Merced represents the newest school in the flagship California university school system.

University of California, Merced was authorized by the California legislature in 1988 to address the higher education needs of the State's fastest growing region, the San Joaquin Valley, a population of over 3.5 million people. It provides adequate capacity for the UC system as a whole and ensures the students from the San Joaquin Valley have expanded options for higher education. High school graduates from the Valley have historically enrolled in the UC system at about half the rate of graduates from other major parts of the State.

The University of California, Merced opened September 5, 2005, as the 10th campus in the UC system. There are three schools, nearly 20 undergraduate majors, nine graduate programs, over 100 full-time faculty members, and dozens of lecturers now teaching hundreds of courses on campus. UC Merced is a thriving campus community of over 2,700 who actively participate in close to 100 clubs and assist the faculty in groundbreaking research opportunities.

In addition to its education mission, UC Merced is an important strategic investment in California's future. The new campus serves as an engine of economic growth throughout the San Joaquin Valley where unemployment and poverty rates exceed California averages.

The University also is helping first-generation college students receive a college education. Accessing a college education has never been more important in light of the current weak economy and job loss.

The Class of 2009 is a class of true pioneers, creating a student government to shape campus policy, campus clubs to enhance social interaction,

and cultivating a culture of social responsibility and civic engagement. These students demonstrated their passion and spirit in a letter-writing campaign to First Lady Michelle Obama. The First Lady acknowledged their zeal by agreeing to deliver the commencement speech this May to the Class of 2009.

Madam Speaker, once again I express my support for the UC Merced resolution, and I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. CARDOZA, for bringing this resolution forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 396, the resolution honoring the first graduating class of the University of California, Merced.

Opening on September 5, 2005, the University of California, Merced became the 10th campus in the University of California system and was founded with a mission to increase college-going rates among students in the San Joaquin Valley. San Joaquin Valley was California's largest and most populous region without a UC campus before the founding of UCM. With a total of just over 2,500 students currently, UCM is expected to grow to about 25,000 students within the next 30 years.

UCM charges just over \$8,000 in tuition and fees; 75 percent of UCM's students receive financial aid; 42 percent of the student population are eligible for Pell Grants. UCM offers 18 undergraduate majors and nine areas of emphasis for graduate students through their three schools, the School of Engineering, the School of Natural Sciences, and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts. It also has plans to open a School of Medicine and a School of Management in upcoming years.

I offer my heartfelt congratulations to the 518 students who have persisted over the past 4 years and will walk across the stage to receive their degree, in acknowledgement of all their hard work, next week.

I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate all of the young individuals who are graduating with their degrees from all of our country's institutions of higher learning. For all these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CARDOZA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, it is with the greatest pleasure and absolute tremendous pride that I rise today to recognize the first full senior class to graduate from the University of California at Merced.

Throughout my career in the legislature in California, and today as a Member of Congress, UC Merced has remained a top priority of mine. In fact, the entire community embraced this project and worked tirelessly for its creation.

Unemployment and poverty rates in the San Joaquin Valley continue to substantially exceed California averages, and high school graduates from the Valley have historically enrolled in the University of California system at about half the rate of graduates from other parts of California. Building the first UC campus in the San Joaquin Valley in Merced increases educational access and opportunity for the Valley's students and enhances job opportunities, new business development, and economic growth throughout Central California and, in fact, our State.

When my dear friend and founding chancellor, Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, was given the daunting task of building UC Merced, she rose to the occasion and she began to plan for a campus that would be infused with her personal strengths of unwavering commitment, innovation, and academic leadership. I believe Carol is watching today, and I wish her my best.

Carol worked collaboratively with government officials, the private sector, nonprofit organizations, and the UC Board of Regents to develop support for the campus and to secure needed funding and authority to develop the campus. Carol often said UC Merced would transform the lives of students in the San Joaquin Valley. Today is a testament to her vision and evidence to this transformation.

UC Merced has built its reputation as the most ethnically diverse institution in the UC system, as well as being the Nation's first major public research university built in the 21st century.

The class of 2009 has played an integral role in UC Merced's success. Whether they were building a student government from scratch or creating numerous clubs or assisting in groundbreaking research, every one of these students has demonstrated a commitment to excellence in academics and a passion to lead the community in the 21st century. At UC Merced, we call them the pioneers.

The best example of the spirit of these students is in their recent campaign to have First Lady Michelle Obama deliver their commencement speech.

□ 1430

Through their own determined efforts and with steadfast perseverance, the student body flooded the First Lady's office with valentines and letters asking her to come to Merced. And their hard work paid off when the First Lady recently announced that she

would attend the May 16 graduation to give that commencement speech. These passionate students have helped put Merced on the road to opportunity and promise to inspire the educational dreams of young people throughout the Central Valley for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating and honoring the historic achievement of UC Merced's first full graduating class, the Class of 2009.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. MILLER, as well as his staff, for their hard work, which has made the dream of college a reality for so many students across the country.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time. I encouraging everybody to support the resolution, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, once again, I call upon my colleagues to support this resolution honoring UC Merced in supporting its students, faculty and the families served, and with that I would like to yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 396, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 313) supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 313

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services have far-reaching effects on the United States economy and the Nation's competitiveness in the world marketplace;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services play a pivotal role in the health, safety, and quality of life of communities throughout the United States;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the skill and dedication of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, representing State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, maintain, and protect the transportation systems, water supply infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the citizens,

communities, and commerce of the United States;

Whereas the Corps of Engineers, in partnership with public port authorities, provides navigational improvements that link United States producers and customers with national and international markets;

Whereas the public waterways, including locks and dams constructed, operated, and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, provide a safe, energy efficient, and cost effective means of transporting goods and services;

Whereas the Corps of Engineers, in partnership with local public entities, provides levees, reservoirs, and other structural and nonstructural flood damage reduction measures that protect millions of families, homes, and businesses;

Whereas a recent analysis of the state of the United States infrastructure garnered an overall grade of "D";

Whereas every \$1 invested in public transportation generates as much as \$6 in economic returns to the Nation's economy;

Whereas the Nation's public transportation systems experienced record ridership levels in 2008 with 10,680,000,000 passenger trips taken;

Whereas infrastructure investment from all levels of government and the private sector is currently \$85,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas the capital asset program of the General Services Administration is authorized annually to provide Federal employees with necessary office space, courts of law, and other special purpose facilities;

Whereas since 1972 the Nation has invested more than \$250,000,000,000 in wastewater infrastructure facilities to establish a system that includes 16,000 publicly owned wastewater treatment plants, 100,000 major pumping stations, 600,000 miles of sanitary sewers, and 200,000 miles of storm sewers;

Whereas the Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration is charged with the safe and secure movement of almost 1,200,000 daily shipments of hazardous materials by all modes of transportation and oversees the safety and security of 2,300,000 miles of gas and hazardous liquid pipelines, which account for 64 percent of the energy commodities consumed in the United States;

Whereas the National Railroad Passenger Corporation annually provides more than 28,000,000 people with intercity rail service;

Whereas 15 new runways, 2 end-around taxiways, and 1 reconfigured runway have opened at the Nation's busiest airports since 2001;

Whereas 3 of the Nation's busiest airports currently have airfield projects (1 new runway, 1 taxiway, and a reconfiguration) under construction to provide an additional 110,900 annual operations and to decrease average delays by approximately 1.5 minutes per operation;

Whereas in the report of the Department of Transportation entitled "2006 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions & Performance", the Department confirms that investment in the Nation's highway, bridge, and transit infrastructure has not kept up with growing demands on the system;

Whereas the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission report estimates that the United States needs to invest up to \$340,000,000,000 annually for the next 50 years to upgrade the Nation's existing transportation network to a good state of repair and to build the more advanced facilities the Nation will require to remain competitive;

Whereas the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission report estimates that, without changes to current policy, revenues raised by all levels

of government for capital investment will total only 36 percent of the \$200,000,000,000 necessary each year to maintain and improve United States highways and transit systems;

Whereas the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission report also finds that there is a growing investment gap in the Nation's infrastructure that will total nearly \$400,000,000,000 in the years 2010 through 2015 and \$2,300,000,000,000 in the years 2010 through 2035; and

Whereas public works professionals are observing National Public Works Week from May 17 through 23, 2009: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve the public infrastructure of the United States and the communities that those professionals serve; and

(3) urges citizens and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government in activities and ceremonies that are designed to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the Nation and to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 313.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I rise in support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, each year during the month of May, we celebrate National Public Works Week. The public works professionals that we recognize today provide the country with essential services and keep our roads safe, our drinking water clean, and our Nation moving. House Resolution 313 honors American public works professionals and celebrates their work from May 17 through 23, 2009.

The public works professionals that we recognize today keep our country running in the most basic and fundamental ways possible. These professionals design, construct and rehabilitate our transportation system, water infrastructure, levees, public buildings and other structures and facilities that are an intimate part of everyday life in the United States.

It is appropriate to set aside 1 week each year to recognize the role that public works play in our daily life. Far too often we take for granted clean water or the method of transportation that we use to get to work. In fact, we

do not begin to fully appreciate these everyday conveniences until they fail us. What happened in New Orleans made the importance of public works crystal clear to everyone. Their lack of clean water, safe infrastructure and basic human needs was a stark reminder that we need to be vigilant to ensure that the citizens of our country get the critical services they need in their lives.

I visited New Orleans numerous times following the hurricane, and I want to encourage everyone not to forget New Orleans, because they still have a ton of rebuilding that needs to be done there and in the other gulf States.

As our Nation's infrastructure ages, it is increasingly likely that more and more elements of it will cease to be productive without renewed investment. It is for this reason that we must recognize the need to revitalize our infrastructure and find ways to make it more efficient.

House Resolution 313 honors the tens of thousands of public works professionals that serve the public quietly. These are the professionals that keep our country operating safely.

Madam Speaker, I support this resolution and hope that all my colleagues will support it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, investment in the Nation's highway, bridge and transit infrastructure has not kept up with growing demands on the system. The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commissions reported that the United States needs to invest up to \$340 billion annually over the next 50 years to upgrade the Nation's transportation network.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has jurisdiction over our water transportation system, which consists of 926 coastal and inland harbors maintained by the Corps of Engineers and 25,000 miles of inland and coastal commercial waterways. If we do not keep our harbors and waterways operating efficiently, we threaten our economic prosperity.

To meet these needs, as well the need for flood protection and environmental restoration, passing a water resources development act for 2010 should be high on the committee's agenda. According to separate studies conducted by the Congressional Budget Office, EPA and municipal groups, the current rate of capital investment will not keep our wastewater treatment systems operational. State and local governments are spending approximately \$10 billion a year in capital investments in wastewater infrastructure. Most of this funding comes from the local taxpayers. However, to meet the needs of communities all over the United States, our Nation should be doubling that spending.

We can't continue to take our wastewater treatment facilities for granted.

Not only are they critical to protecting our health and the environment; they are critical to protecting our economy and our way of life. Public infrastructure plays a critical role in enhancing our quality of life, improving our environment and contributes to our economic prosperity.

We take these systems and the professionals, engineers and administrators for granted. So it is important for Congress to recognize the contribution they make to ensuring America remains the world's premier economic power.

I appreciate Mr. OBERSTAR in bringing this resolution forward. I urge all Members to support H. Res. 313.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield as much time as she may consume to Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thanks to Ms. BROWN and Mr. BOOZMAN for handling this legislation today. Today we considered House Resolution 313, recognizing National Public Works Week from May 17 through May 23, 2009.

The National Public Works Week is celebrated in May each year. This resolution pays tribute to the professionals that design, build and maintain critical elements of our Nation's infrastructure. This body has always understood the value of these professionals and what they bring to our society. Professionals in the public works sector provide us with safe and efficient roads, access to clean drinking water and other essential services that keep our country running.

It has become increasingly important that Congress designate 1 week each year to recognize those who work in the public works sector. Many people take for granted the public transportation system they use to commute each day or the safe running water in their homes. Far too often we do not realize the importance of these systems until something goes wrong.

At the beginning of this Congress, the House passed a key water infrastructure bill, H.R. 1262, the Water Quality Investment Act of 2009. And this piece of legislation increases authorization levels of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, grants provided by the Environmental Protection Agency to address combined and sanitary sewer overflows, as well as grants for alternative water source projects. These grants will go one step further to ensure that every American has access to clean water.

Madam Speaker, on February 17, 2009, President Obama signed into law the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act. The legislation provides for over \$64 billion in investment in our Nation's highway system, rail system and environmental infrastructure, not enough but steps in the right direction. It is investment in these areas as well as other critical infrastructure areas that will put America back to work

and see us out of these troubling economic times.

I'm grateful for the administrators, engineers and servicemen who continue to utilize their skills and dedication to provide these essential services to us.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to join me and give our public works professionals the recognition that they deserve.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 313, supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week.

H. Res. 313 recognizes the week of May 17 through 23, 2009, as National Public Works Week and pays tribute to our public works professionals. This week has been designated by a variety of groups to celebrate those public works professionals who keep our nation running in the most basic and fundamental ways.

These professionals protect our public health, our economy, and our communities. They design, build, and maintain vital transportation systems, levees, sewage systems, and public buildings that enhance everyday life in our nation.

Today, we are all eminently aware of the financial issues that Americans are facing. What we are less aware of, however, is the current state of our nation's failing infrastructure. Critical elements of our highway system, drinking water infrastructure, and wastewater treatment facilities, are failing us in dangerous ways.

To reinvigorate our economy, Congress passed the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009. This landmark piece of legislation invests in key infrastructure areas, is currently putting Americans back to work in the public works sector, and is improving the state of our nation's infrastructure.

The Recovery Act provides \$64.1 billion of investment in critical transportation and infrastructure programs. These investments include:

- \$27.5 billion for highways and bridges;
- \$8.4 billion for public transit capital investment;
- \$4 billion for state water pollution control revolving funds;
- \$4.6 billion for water-related infrastructure of the Corps of Engineers; and
- \$5.575 billion for federal buildings.

I am confident that investment in these areas will put more of our nation's public works professionals back to work and improve our economy. Just last week, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a hearing on the implementation of the Recovery Act and found that as of March 31st, more than 1,250 people have been put back to work in 263 highways projects in 30 states.

As a result of our efforts, more than 1,200 families can rest more easily with the promise of a paycheck, and can continue to make the day-to-day expenditures that will help turn this economy around.

This is the promise that Congress made to the American people—to invest wisely in our infrastructure systems and help the nation's economy recover.

We cannot underestimate the importance of infrastructure investment. Quite frankly, the

public works professionals that we are honoring today protect our citizens, our economy, and our communities.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BOOZMAN. After thanking the chairlady for being here and Mr. OBERSTAR for bringing this bill forward, I urge support and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 313.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING MOTORCYCLE SAFETY AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 269) supporting the goals of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 269

Whereas approximately 7,000,000 motorcyclists ride on our Nation's roads and highways to commute, travel, and recreate;

Whereas motorcycles are a valuable component of the transportation mix;

Whereas motorcycles are fuel-efficient and decrease congestion while having little impact on our Nation's transportation infrastructure;

Whereas the United States is the world leader in motorcycle safety, promoting education, licensing, use of protective gear, and motorcycle awareness;

Whereas the motorcycling community is committed to decreasing motorcycle crashes through licensing, training, education, enforcement, personal responsibility, and increased public awareness;

Whereas, according to a comprehensive study conducted on motorcycle crash causation in the United States the "Motorcycle Accident Cause Factors and Identification of Countermeasures" (Hurt Report), in approximately two-thirds of fatal car-motorcycle crashes, the driver of the car was at fault;

Whereas motorcycle awareness is beneficial to all road users and will help to decrease car-motorcycle crashes;

Whereas May is designated as "Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month"; and

Whereas the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration promotes Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month to encourage riders to always wear helmets and other protective gear, never drink and ride, be properly licensed, and get training and to remind all riders and motorists to always share the road: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the contribution motorcyclists make to the transportation mix;

(2) encourages all road users to be more aware of motorcycles and motorcyclists' safety;

(3) encourages all riders to receive appropriate training and practice safe riding skills; and

(4) supports the goals of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 269.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I rise in support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 269, which seeks to support the goals of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) for introducing this resolution and bringing much-needed attention to motorcycle safety in our Nation's roadways.

With May once again bringing warm weather, highways nationwide will witness the seasonal rise of motorcycle riders. The popularity of motorcycles climbs every year, with motorcycle registrations increasing by over 60 percent from 1998 to 2005.

In anticipation of this rise in ridership, it is important to educate the public about motorcycle safety. Public awareness of motorcycle safety benefits everyone sharing the roads, not just the motorcyclists, by reducing the number of car-motorcycle crashes.

In 2007, motorcycle fatalities increased for the 10th straight year in a row. According to the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration, there were 5,154 motorcycle fatalities and 130,000 injuries in 2007. This tragic statistic is much higher than the 2,116 fatalities and 53 million injuries recorded in 1997.

One of the most effective ways to reduce motorcycle crash fatalities is to encourage riders to always wear a helmet. NHTSA estimates that helmet usage saved the lives of 1,784 motorcyclists in 2007 and could have saved another 800 lives if the motorcyclists killed in non-helmeted crashes had been wearing their helmet.

Throughout the month of May, safety groups across the Nation will host educational events and media campaigns highlighting these safety tools and promoting safe driving practices. Through these efforts, we can work to reduce the number of preventable tragedies that far too often devastate our communities.

While I was a State legislator, I fought hard to keep helmet laws in

place. But, sadly, my home State of Florida now allows people to ride without helmets. With greater freedom comes greater responsibility. Motorcycle accidents without helmets increase the insurance rates, burden the health care system and cause great pain for families.

I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for introducing this resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to voice my strong support for H. Res. 269, and I want to commend the primary sponsor of this resolution, Dr. BURNESS, from whom we will hear in just a few minutes.

The resolution expresses support for the goals of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month. As the weather gets warmer across the country, our Nation's highways will experience a very large increase in motorcycle traffic. Because of the increased ridership and potential for accidents, each year May is designated Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month.

During the month, State agencies and motorcycle organizations across the country conduct a variety of activities to remind all riders and motorists to share the road. These activities also encourage riders to be properly licensed, receive proper training, never drink and drive, and wear protective head wear.

As the popularity of this mode of transportation increases, Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month will continue to help drivers of cars, trucks and motorcycles consider the safety of all users of the road.

In approximately two-thirds of fatal car versus motorcycle crashes, the driver of the car is at fault. The activities associated with this resolution will help make all users of our Nation's highways safer.

Additionally, this resolution recognizes the transportation benefits associated with motorcycling. Motorcycles are a fuel-efficient and congestion-decreasing mode of transportation, in addition to having little impact on our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

From a personal standpoint, Madam Speaker, I will tell you that a couple of years ago the youngest of our four children, my son who is now 23, he bought a used 1979 Honda motorcycle for, I think, \$625. Ever since that time, I have read almost every day in the Knoxville News Sentinel something I never noticed before, and that is that almost every day there seems to be a serious motorcycle wreck and often a motorcycle fatality reported on in our local daily newspaper. I have expressed my concern to my son about trying to be as safe as possible, and I believe thus far he is.

I have also noticed that the largest number of motorcycle riders now are people in their forties, fifties, and sixties. Knoxville has hosted several times something called the Honda Hoot where we have over 20,000 motorcyclists come in, most people middle aged and older. So motorcycle ridership is growing by leaps and bounds, and in many ways that is a good thing. But this resolution calls the attention of everyone, motorcycle riders and others, to the need to try to be as safe as possible when using this form of vehicle travel.

I support this resolution and hope it brings attention to motorcycle safety across our Nation's highways as well as the additional benefits of motorcycling. I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor at this time to recognize the primary sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, who has become such a leader in so many areas in this Congress, and this resolution is just another prime example. I recognize him for such time as he may consume.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I should start by offering special thanks to the Motorcycle Industry Council and the American Motorcyclist Association who have really helped shepherd this bill through the various congressional committees and through Congress.

Madam Speaker, \$300, that is what I paid for my first motorcycle. Throw in another \$20 for the helmet, the freedom, the fresh air, the open road in Texas, the exhilaration was priceless. There are a lot of bikers out there who know exactly what I feel about riding along on the open road, especially in a beautiful State like Texas.

Gas prices last year were on the rise. The gentleman from Tennessee mentioned better weather heading our way. More people across America are going to start using their motorcycles, using them to go to work, travel, or just go for a ride and enjoy the freedom that is uniquely American.

Yet as ridership increases, so does the risk for everyone on the road. Last year in the Lone Star State alone, preliminary numbers revealed that more than 9,100 motorcycle crashes accounted for more than 400 deaths.

As a doctor, I have been in plenty of emergency rooms and trauma centers. Take it from someone with nearly 25 years of experience in medicine, you don't want to be involved in a crash of any kind, but most particularly in a motorcycle accident. As the old saying goes, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. For bikers, prevention is riding the right way, and that is responsibly. That means getting trained. That means you don't do motocross on

suburban streets. That means you wear protective gear. That means you are aware of the cars and trucks around you.

For other drivers, drivers in the larger vehicles, prevention means keeping your eyes open and staying alert. Something as simple as conversing on the cell phone or comforting a crying child is a dangerous distraction that can lead to a crash as well.

Abundant caution for all drivers is essential and encouraged. But accidents do happen, and when they do, people need to receive proper medical care to treat their injuries.

That is why for the past several years I have introduced legislation to close a loophole on the HIPAA health care law that allows insurers to deny payment for injuries sustained while engaged in certain recreational activities, including riding a motorcycle.

The original point of this law was to make health plans more accountable to the people they cover, but these very same provisions are hurting the people they intend to help. Congress is charged with making laws to protect people. When these laws have the opposite effect, we also have the responsibility to fix them and fix them immediately. This loophole has been a problem for almost 12 years. The time has come to fix it.

I am grateful to say H.R. 1086 passed out of our committee earlier this year. It allows for increased transparency so that people are at least entitled to know the information of what their policy does or doesn't cover, and it must be spelled out up front in a language that everyone can understand.

The time has certainly come for riders and those who desire to ride in the future to listen to the wise advice of people, like our former Transportation Secretary, Secretary Mary Peters, who happened to ride a Harley herself, who was steadfast in her support for this legislation in many Congresses past, and I am sure would join with me today in supporting this legislation.

As I stand here in support of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month, I am extremely cognizant of the current problems that the motorcycle industry has been having with the Consumer Product Safety Commission, specifically the bill H.R. 4040 that became the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act that we passed in the last Congress.

Motorcycle dealers are small businesses, and we have put a burden on them that is, in fact, putting their business in danger of survival. And at a time when our economy is losing jobs, we can scarcely afford to continue that.

It is reported today that the President intends to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with a 71 percent increase in resources than what they had before to enforce the sweeping laws that were passed in the last Congress. No law has been more sweeping than the Consumer Product

Safety Improvement Act. Unfortunately, it has swept up businesses Congress did not intend to be swept away.

So yesterday, the Consumer Product Safety Commission issued a Federal Register notice providing a stay of enforcement for the motorcycle industry, but a stay is not enough. These businesses need the assurance that they will not be again required to close down. So I introduced a bill earlier this year, H.R. 1587, to permanently exclude the ATV, motorcycle and snowmobile industries from the application of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act because what child under the age of 12 is going to get lead poisoning from consuming the battery in their ATV? In fact, there is the potential for more harm to a child by having them ride an adult-sized ATV or motorcycle than there is the risk of the child consuming the battery that is contained within their motorcycle.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission cannot do the job that it needs to do without an administrator. It requires the leadership of the administrator of the Consumer Product Safety Commission to winnow out the intent of Congress and to put this law on the track on which it was intended.

So while I enthusiastically support President Obama for trying to give the Consumer Product Safety Commission more resources, what the Consumer Product Safety Commission really needs is leadership. I ask the President to nominate an administrator for the Consumer Product Safety Commission so they can provide the leadership to truly impute congressional intent.

If there ever was a bipartisan issue on which both Democrats and Republicans can agree to, it is the fact that the CPSC needs a new administrator, and some common sense needs to be applied to the act that we passed in the last Congress called the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Florida for yielding me this time.

I would like to speak on behalf of the Rhode Island Motorcycle Association. They are a group of individuals who have taught me a great deal about the safety issues that they face on a daily basis as they ride their motorcycles. They talk to me frequently about the mandates that they face in regards to the helmet laws that face them and others around the country.

Many of them say that of course helmets are a great safety factor if you are going up to 30 miles per hour; but most of them are driving well over 30 miles per hour, and after 30 miles per hour, a helmet won't do you much good.

When you look at the numbers here, about two-thirds of the fatal car-motorcycle crashes, it is the driver who is at fault. Many of them contend that

those who are wearing the helmets often do not have the peripheral vision to know when the car is coming at them. When they are going through traffic and they have this big, bulky helmet on them, they cannot hear nor see where those cars are because of the blockage of their peripheral vision because of the helmet.

Many of them like wearing the helmets, but they want the choice. That is all they ask for. In that case they said let them decide when they ride as to whether to wear a helmet or not. They simply want that choice.

I think, as a matter of safety, it is important for us to make sure that the other motorists on the road know to be aware of motorcyclists, and I enjoy seeing bumper stickers, "Beware of Motorcyclists on Road." I certainly am aware, whenever there is a motorcyclist pulling up, always to be aware to give them plenty of space, and I think most people would agree with me. But that is something in this bill that it calls for other motorcyclists to share the road and other motorists to share the road, that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration should promote that much more as well. Seeing there are more motorcyclists on the road, it is important that we get this message across. And on behalf of the Rhode Island Motorcyclist Association, I am happy to send their message to Congress.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers and so I would just like to urge passage of this very fine resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 269, supporting the goals of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month and bringing much needed attention to motorcycle safety on our nation's roadways. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) for bringing this important issue to the forefront.

With the arrival of spring's warmer weather, our nation's highways will once again experience a large increase in the number of motorcycle riders across the country. Motorcycles represent a valuable component of the transportation network in our nation. In 2006, there were more than 6.7 million registered motorcycles in the United States. Motorcycles continue to grow in popularity each year with motorcycle registrations increasing by over 60 percent from 1998 to 2005.

Motorcycles are a fuel-efficient and congestion-decreasing mode of transportation. This increasingly popular mode of transportation also requires greater attention to the safety concerns associated with riding. However, because of motorcycles' smaller size, motorcyclists are often hidden in a vehicle's blind spot. Public awareness of motorcycle safety benefits everyone that uses our nation's roadways, not just motorcyclists, because it can lead to a decrease in car-motorcycle crashes.

In 2007, motorcycle rider fatalities increased for the tenth straight year. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

(NHTSA), between 1997 and 2007 there were 38,566 motorcyclist fatalities and 756,000 motorcyclist injuries on U.S. roadways. In 2007 alone, there were 5,154 motorcycle fatalities and 103,000 injuries, up from 2,116 fatalities and 53,000 injuries in 1997. These statistics on motorcycle fatalities and injuries each year further illustrate the importance of public awareness and the need for greater education of all roadway users.

Per vehicle mile traveled, motorcyclists are approximately 35 times more likely than passenger car occupants to die in a motor vehicle traffic crash and 8 times more likely to be injured. Further, an estimated 142,000 motorcyclists have been killed since the enactment of the Highway Safety and National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. A NHTSA-funded study, the "Motorcycle Accident Cause Factors and Identification of Countermeasures Study", found that in approximately two-thirds of fatal car-motorcycle crashes, the driver of the car was at fault.

Throughout Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month, riders are encouraged to become educated on the importance of following the rules of the roadway, being alert to other drivers, and always wearing protective gear such as a helmet. NHTSA estimates that helmets saved 1,784 motorcyclists' lives in 2007, and that 800 more lives could have been saved if the motorcyclists involved in fatal non-helmeted crashes had worn helmets.

These striking statistics paint a very clear portrait of the need to decrease motorcycle crashes through licensing, rider training, education, enforcement, personal responsibility, and increased public awareness.

I urge my colleagues to join me in agreeing to this resolution.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I am proud today to highlight May as "Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month, and to rise in support of House Resolution 269, which I introduced with my colleague from Texas, Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS.

Our resolution recognizes the importance of motorcycles, and encourages riders to always wear helmets and other protective gear, to never drink and ride and to be properly licensed and trained.

H. Res. 269 also serves as a reminder to all riders and motorists to always share the road respectfully.

I have been riding and racing motorcycles for over 20 years—so the issue of motorcycle safety is of great importance to me.

Sadly, it is true that motorcycles have a higher rate of fatal accidents than automobiles.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, motorcyclist fatalities increased by 57 percent between 2002 and 2007.

Motorcyclists are about 35 times more likely than passenger car occupants to die in a motor vehicle traffic crash and 8 times more likely to be injured.

As motorcyclists across the country gear up for the upcoming riding season, these startling statistics highlight the need for safety education.

They also reflect the growing popularity of motorcycles. Over the past decade, U.S. motorcycle sales have more than tripled.

In my home state of Arizona we have more than 150,000 registered motorcycles.

With over 300 days of sunshine in our state every year, you can imagine why so many Arizonans choose to ride their bikes!

There are many other reasons why motorcycles are so popular, but one explanation is simple economics: motorcycles offer a more fuel efficient—and cheaper way—of getting around.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, motorcycles consume 56% less fuel per mile traveled.

On average, motorcycles can get between 40 and 75 miles per gallon of gas.

I am proud that, as a motorcyclist, I can leave a smaller footprint on our earth by riding my bike.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the Motorcycle Industry Council, the American Motorcyclist Association, and the Motorcycle Riders Foundation for all that they do to support motorcyclists.

I am pleased that the House will be considering H. Res. 269 today, and I urge its swift passage.

Thank you and Happy Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month!

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 269.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL TRAIN DAY

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 367) supporting the goals and ideals of National Train Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 367

Whereas in May 1869, the "golden spike" was driven into the final tie at Promontory Summit, Utah, to join the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific Railroads, ceremonially completing the first transcontinental railroad and therefore connecting both coasts of the United States;

Whereas in highly populated regions Amtrak trains and infrastructure carry commuters to and from work in congested metropolitan areas providing a reliable rail option, reducing congestion on roads and in the skies;

Whereas for many rural Americans, Amtrak represents the only major intercity transportation link to the rest of the country;

Whereas passenger trains provide a more fuel-efficient transportation system thereby providing cleaner transportation alternatives and energy security;

Whereas intercity passenger rail was 18 percent more energy efficient than airplanes and 25 percent more energy efficient than automobiles on a per-passenger-mile basis in 2006;

Whereas Amtrak annually provides intercity passenger rail travel to over 25,000,000 Americans residing in 46 States;

Whereas an increasing number of people are using trains for travel purposes beyond commuting to and from work;

Whereas community railroad stations are a source of civic pride, a gateway to over 500 of our Nation's communities, and a tool for economic growth; and

Whereas Amtrak has designated May 9, 2009, as National Train Day to celebrate the way trains connect people and places: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the contribution trains make to the national transportation system;

(2) urges the people of the United States to recognize such a day as an opportunity to learn more about trains; and

(3) supports the goals and ideals of National Train Day as designated by Amtrak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 367.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

National Train Day celebrates the 140th anniversary of the golden spike, which was driven into the final tie in Utah, and marked the completion of our Nation's first transcontinental railroad in 1869.

□ 1500

Last year, I celebrated National Train Day by holding events throughout my district, including press conferences and events in Jacksonville, Winter Park, and the Sanford Auto Train station. We had a great turnout at all of the events, and I heard firsthand from people who use Amtrak every day to go to work and visit friends and families all over the country.

This year, I will be holding an event on Friday at my hometown station in Jacksonville, and I am planning a trip to New York in the very near future and hope other Members will join me. But we should celebrate Train Day every day, and I encourage Members to do events at their train stations throughout the year.

As Chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, I have had the privilege to see firsthand passenger rail systems in other countries. I took the high-speed train from Brussels to Paris—200 miles in 1 hour and 15 minutes; from Barcelona to Madrid—350 miles in 2.5 hours. The advantage for travelers and the business community and others is tremendous.

We need to catch up with the world; and with gas prices continuing to increase steadily, now is the perfect time for us to make serious our investment in passenger rail.

Amtrak ridership and revenue have never been stronger. In 2008, Amtrak set a record for ridership, exceeding 28.7 million passengers. In the same year, ticket revenues increased by 14.2 percent, for more than \$1.7 billion. For my State of Florida, Amtrak expenditures for goods and services were over \$40 million last year, and we currently have over 700 Floridians as employees.

More than just a convenient way to travel, Amtrak is the most energy efficient. Rail travel is more efficient than cars or airplanes. According to U.S. Department of Energy data, Amtrak is 17 percent more efficient than domestic airline travel and 21 percent more efficient than auto travel.

Passenger rail also reduces global warming. The average passenger train produces 60 percent lower carbon emissions than cars, and 50 percent less than airplanes.

I travel all over the country and have conducted many transportation roundtable events that feature rail and its importance. Let me tell you that people love Amtrak and they love the train. It is a great way to commute to work, take cars off congested highways, and improve the environment. In many areas of the country, it is the only mode of public transportation. Let me repeat that: in many areas of the country, Amtrak is the only mode of public transportation available.

We still have a lot of work ahead of us with Amtrak, but we took a major step forward last year when we passed legislation reauthorizing Amtrak at a level that would allow it to grow and prosper, and earlier this year when we provided \$1.7 billion in stimulus funding for Amtrak, and \$8 billion for development of a high-speed rail corridor.

Major infrastructure improvements are still necessary to improve the safety and security of the system and its passengers and workers. Amtrak has and will continue to play a critical role in evacuating and transporting citizens during national emergencies. Unfortunately, it also is a prime target for those who wish to harm us, and we must provide resources to make the system less vulnerable.

Fifty years ago, President Eisenhower created the National Highway System that changed the way we travel in this country. Today, we need to do the same with our rail system; and with the Amtrak reauthorization and real funding for high-speed rail, we are doing that.

The United States used to have a first-class passenger rail system. However, after years of neglect, we are now the caboose—and they don't use cabooses anymore. The American people deserve better, and I believe our government's new commitment to Amtrak will go a long way to restore passenger rail service.

I encourage my colleagues to show their support for our Nation's rail system and its employees by holding events at their local commuter train stations anytime during the year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The ceremonial golden spike hammered at Promontory Summit, Utah, May 10, 1869, marked the completion of the transcontinental railroad, one of the Nation's greatest engineering masterpieces. It also marked the birth of what would become the greatest rail network in the world and 140 years later, we are still reaping the benefits of our ancestors' vision.

The United States now has over 140,000 miles of railroads, making up the transportation backbone of this Nation. Our railroads are environmentally friendly, producing significantly less pollution than other modes of transportation. A train can haul one ton of freight 436 miles on one gallon of diesel fuel, and it is three times cleaner than other modes. Trains also help to alleviate the congestion on our crowded highways. One train can actually take 280 trucks off the road.

The deregulation law of 1980, the Staggers Act, has been an unparalleled success. We must take great care to protect the regulatory environment that has allowed the railroads to thrive and resist any effort that would undo all of the progress that this industry has made in efficiency and safety.

On the passenger rail side, last year President Bush signed into law an Amtrak reauthorization that will take this country into the next generation of passenger rail service. The law makes important reforms to Amtrak and also creates a role for the private sector in the passenger rail industry.

The Amtrak reauthorization, the first in a decade, created a framework for a public-private partnership for the construction of true high-speed rail corridors all over this Nation. High-speed rail promises safe, fast, and convenient service—all the while helping to alleviate aviation and highway congestion we face in this country.

The continued success of the railroad industry is vital to this country's economy. I would therefore urge passage of H. Res. 367, which would create National Train Day on May 9.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance of intercity passenger rail in the United States and express my support for Amtrak in conjunction with its 2nd Annual National Train Day on May 9, 2009.

National Train Day was established to celebrate train travel in America on the anniversary of completing the first transcontinental railroad 140 years ago. To mark the day, Amtrak is hosting free events across the country to teach adults and children about Amtrak and the benefits of intercity passenger rail.

Passenger rail's benefits indeed are myriad. The Department of Transportation has described the problem of congestion on our highways and in the air as "chronic". Amtrak removes almost 8 million cars from the road annually. Airports are also experiencing significant delays, with more than 550,000 flights departing or arriving late in 2008. Amtrak eases air congestion by eliminating the need for 50,000 fully loaded airplanes each year.

Amtrak is substantially more environmentally friendly than automobiles or airplanes. In fact, according to the World Resources Institute, rail transportation produces 57 percent less carbon emissions than airplanes, and 40 percent less carbon emissions than cars. Additionally, Amtrak has taken decisive action to reduce its carbon footprint as well, committing to reduce emissions from its diesel locomotives by 6 percent from 2003 through 2010, the largest voluntary emissions commitment in the United States.

Amtrak serves more than 500 destinations in 46 States over 21,000 miles of routes, and employs more than 18,000 people. Amtrak has come a long way since its inception in 1971 and now its beginning its 39th year of operation. The service has faced many challenges over the years, but continues to grow stronger with each passing year. Despite past uneven Federal investment, Amtrak has persevered, achieving many successes in improved operating efficiency, increased ridership, and higher revenue.

In fact, in FY 2008, Amtrak set new ridership and revenue records for the sixth year in a row, exceeding 28.7 million passengers and \$2.45 billion in revenue. These increases are being enjoyed across Amtrak's entire network. In FY 2008, Amtrak held a 62 percent share of the air/rail market between New York and Washington, and a 47 percent share of the air/rail market between New York and Boston, up 6 percent in each market from FY 2007. This increase shows that, where Amtrak is provided the resources to succeed, it provides a trip-time competitive alternative to air and car.

At a time when jobs are being lost, the transportation network is getting more congested, and global climate change is taking its toll, supporting passenger rail has never been so critical. Recognizing the need for passenger rail investment, Congress passed the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act last fall, reigniting America's commitment to both intercity and high-speed passenger rail. Among the steps taken to broaden our use of passenger rail, this legislation provided capital grants for Amtrak to bring the Northeast Corridor and other rail network infrastructure to a state-of-good-repair, encouraged intercity passenger rail investment through an 80–20 matching grant program, and created a grant program to finance the construction and equipment for 11 authorized high-speed rail corridors.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act gave high-speed and intercity passenger rail another immediate boost, providing \$8 billion in capital grants to States for development of high-speed rail and another \$1.3 billion for Amtrak. This funding is setting us on a course to link regions of the country with a safe, fast, and environmentally friendly mode of transportation. It truly is an exciting and historic time for our transportation network.

Madam Speaker, I lend my strong support to Amtrak and the commemoration of National

Train Day on May 9, 2009, and encourage all of my colleagues to use this excellent opportunity to reflect on the benefits that Amtrak and intercity passenger rail provide to our Nation.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 367.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 299, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 338, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 353, de novo.

Proceedings on House Resolutions 348 and 367 will resume on another day.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 299, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 299.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, answered "present" 4, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]
YEAS—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin

Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria

Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin

Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth

Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungrun, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)

Price (NC)	Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Austria	Doggett	Klein (FL)	Peters	Sarbanes	Terry
Putnam	Schwartz	Thornberry	Baca	Donnelly (IN)	Kline (MN)	Peterson	Scalise	Thompson (CA)
Quigley	Scott (GA)	Tiahrt	Bachmann	Doyle	Kosmas	Petri	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Radanovich	Scott (VA)	Tiberi	Bachus	Dreier	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)	Schauer	Thompson (PA)
Rahall	Sensenbrenner	Tierney	Baird	Driedhaus	Kucinich	Pitts	Schiff	Thornberry
Rangel	Serrano	Titus	Baldwin	Duncan	Lamborn	Platts	Schmidt	Tiahrt
Rehberg	Sessions	Tonko	Barrett (SC)	Edwards (MD)	Lance	Poe (TX)	Schock	Tiberi
Reichert	Sestak	Towns	Barrow	Edwards (TX)	Langevin	Polis (CO)	Schrader	Tierney
Reyes	Shadegg	Tsongas	Bartlett	Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Schwartz	Titus
Richardson	Shea-Porter	Turner	Bartol (TX)	Ellison	Larson (CT)	Posey	Scott (GA)	Tonko
Rodriguez	Sherman	Upton	Bean	Ellsworth	Latham	Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Towns
Roe (TN)	Shinkus	Van Hollen	Becerra	Emerson	LaTourette	Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Tsongas
Rogers (AL)	Shuler	Velázquez	Berkley	Engel	Latta	Putnam	Serrano	Turner
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Visclosky	Berman	Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Quigley	Sessions	Upton
Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Walden	Berry	Etheridge	Lee (NY)	Radanovich	Sestak	Van Hollen
Rohrabacher	Sires	Walz	Biggart	Fallin	Levin	Rahall	Shadegg	Velázquez
Rooney	Skelton	Wamp	Bilbray	Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rangel	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Wasserman	Bilirakis	Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rehberg	Sherman	Walden
Roskam	Smith (NE)	Schultz	Bishop (GA)	Filner	Linder	Reyes	Shuler	Walz
Ross	Smith (NJ)	Waters	Bishop (NY)	Flake	Lipinski	Richardson	Shuster	Wamp
Rothman (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Watson	Bishop (UT)	Fleming	LoBiondo	Rodriguez	Simpson	Wasserman
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Watt	Blackburn	Forbes	Loeback	Roe (TN)	Sires	Schultz
Royce	Snyder	Waxman	Blumenauer	Foster	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)	Skelton	Waters
Ruppersberger	Souder	Weiner	Blunt	Fox	Lowey	Rogers (KY)	Slaughter	Watson
Rush	Space	Welch	Boccieri	Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Watt
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Westmoreland	Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Wexler	Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Luján	Rooney	Smith (TX)	Weiner
Salazar	Stearns	Whitfield	Bono Mack	Fudge	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Welch
Sánchez, Linda T.	Stupak	Wilson (OH)	Boozman	Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel E.	Roskam	Snyder	Westmoreland
Sánchez, Loretta T.	Sutton	Wilson (SC)	Boren	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Ross	Souder	Wexler
Sarbanes	Tanner	Wittman	Boswell	Gerlach	Mack	Rothman (NJ)	Space	Whitfield
Scalise	Tauscher	Wolf	Boucher	Giffords	Maffei	Roybal-Allard	Speier	Wilson (OH)
Schakowsky	Taylor	Woolsey	Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney	Royce	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Schauer	Teague	Wu	Boyd	Gohmert	Manzullo	Ruppersberger	Stearns	Wittman
Schiff	Terry	Yarmuth	Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Marchant	Rush	Stupak	Wolf
Schmidt	Thompson (CA)	Young (AK)	Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)	Sullivan	Woolsey
Schock	Thompson (MS)	Young (FL)	Brady (IA)	Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Sutton	Wu
			Bright	Granger	Marshall	Salazar	Tanner	Yarmuth
			Brown (GA)	Graves	Massa	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tauscher	Young (AK)
			Brown (SC)	Grayson	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Teague	Young (FL)
			Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	Matsui			
			Brown-Waite, Ginny	Green, Gene	McCarthy (CA)			
			Buchanan	Griffith	McCarthy (NY)			
			Burgess	Grijalva	McCaul			
			Burton (IN)	Guthrie	McClintock			
			Butterfield	Gutierrez	McCollum			
			Buyer	Hall (NY)	McCotter			
			Calvert	Hall (TX)	McDermott			
			Camp	Halvorson	McGovern			
			Campbell	Hare	McHenry			
			Cantor	Harman	McHugh			
			Cao	Harper	McIntyre			
			Capps	Hastings (FL)	McKeon			
			Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	McMahon			
			Carnahan	Heinrich	McMorris			
			Carney	Heller	Rodgers			
			Carson (IN)	Hensarling	McNerney			
			Carter	Herger	Meek (FL)			
			Cassidy	Hereth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)			
			Castle	Higgins	Melancon			
			Castor (FL)	Hill	Mica			
			Chaffetz	Himes	Michaud			
			Chandler	Hinchee	Miller (FL)			
			Childers	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)			
			Clarke	Hirono	Miller (NC)			
			Clay	Hodes	Miller, Gary			
			Cleaver	Hoekstra	Miller, George			
			Clyburn	Holden	Minnick			
			Coble	Holt	Mitchell			
			Coffman (CO)	Honda	Mollohan			
			Cohen	Hoyer	Moore (KS)			
			Cole	Hunter	Moore (WI)			
			Conaway	Inglis	Moran (KS)			
			Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Moran (VA)			
			Cooper	Issa	Murphy (CT)			
			Costa	Jackson (IL)	Murphy (NY)			
			Costello	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Murphy, Patrick			
			Courtney	Jenkins	Murphy, Tim			
			Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Myrick			
			Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Nadler (NY)			
			Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano			
			Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Neal (MA)			
			Cummings	Jones	Neugebauer			
			Dahlkemper	Jordan (OH)	Nunes			
			Davis (AL)	Kagen	Nye			
			Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Oberstar			
			Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Obey			
			Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Olson			
			Davis (TN)	Kildee	Olver			
			DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz			
			DeGette	Kilroy	Pallone			
			Delahunt	Kind	Pastor (AZ)			
			DeLauro	King (IA)	Paul			
			Dent	King (NY)	Paulsen			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Payne			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Pence			
			Dicks	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter			
			Dingell	Kissell	Perriello			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Blackburn Conaway
Campbell Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—10

Boucher Deal (GA) Pascrell
Capito Dingell Stark
Capuano Fortenberry
Conyers Murtha

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1534

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL
COMMUNITY COLLEGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 338, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 338.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie Adler (NJ) Altmire
Ackerman Akin Andrews
Aderholt Alexander Arcuri

NOT VOTING—9

Capito Deal (GA) Murtha
Capuano Fortenberry Pascrell
Conyers Israel Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1545

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING GLOBAL YOUTH
SERVICE DAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 353.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 353.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—424

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Jordan (OH)
Ackerman	Davis (KY)	Kagen
Aderholt	Davis (TN)	Kanjorski
Adler (NJ)	DeFazio	Kaptur
Akin	DeGette	Kennedy
Alexander	Delahunt	Kildee
Altmire	DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)
Andrews	Dent	Kilroy
Arcuri	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind
Austria	Diaz-Balart, M.	King (IA)
Baca	Dicks	King (NY)
Bachmann	Dingell	Kingston
Bachus	Doggett	Kirk
Baird	Donnelly (IN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Baldwin	Doyle	Kissell
Barrett (SC)	Drier	Klein (FL)
Barrow	Driehaus	Kline (MN)
Bartlett	Duncan	Kosmas
Barton (TX)	Edwards (MD)	Kratovil
Bean	Edwards (TX)	Kucinich
Becerra	Ehlers	Lamborn
Berkley	Ellison	Lance
Berman	Ellsworth	Langevin
Berry	Emerson	Larsen (WA)
Biggart	Engel	Larsen (CT)
Bilbray	Eshoo	Latham
Bilirakis	Etheridge	LaTourette
Bishop (GA)	Fallin	Latta
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lee (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Lee (NY)
Blackburn	Filner	Levin
Blumenauer	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Blunt	Fleming	Lewis (GA)
Boccieri	Forbes	Linder
Boehner	Foster	Lipinski
Bonner	Fox	LoBiondo
Bono Mack	Frank (MA)	Loeb
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Boswell	Fudge	Lucas
Boucher	Gallely	Luetkemeyer
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	Lujan
Boyd	Gerlach	Lummis
Brady (PA)	Giffords	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Braley (IA)	Gohmert	Lynch
Bright	Gonzalez	Mack
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Maffei
Brown (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Maloney
Brown, Corrine	Granger	Manzullo
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Marchant
Ginny	Grayson	Markey (CO)
Buchanan	Green, Al	Markey (MA)
Burgess	Green, Gene	Marshall
Burton (IN)	Griffith	Massa
Butterfield	Grijalva	Matheson
Buyer	Guthrie	Matsui
Calvert	Gutierrez	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Hall (NY)	McCarthy (NY)
Campbell	Hall (TX)	McCaul
Cantor	Halvorson	McClintock
Cao	Hare	McCollum
Capps	Harman	McCotter
Cardoza	Harper	McDermott
Carahan	Hastings (FL)	McGovern
Carney	Hastings (WA)	McHenry
Carson (IN)	Heinrich	McHugh
Carter	Heller	McIntyre
Cassidy	Hensarling	McKeon
Castle	Hesler	McMahon
Castor (FL)	Herseth Sandlin	McMorris
Chaffetz	Higgins	Rodgers
Chandler	Himes	McNerney
Childers	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Clarke	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Clay	Hirono	Melancon
Cleaver	Hodes	Mica
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Michaud
Coble	Holden	Miller (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Holt	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Honda	Miller (NC)
Cole	Hoyer	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Hunter	Miller, George
Connolly (VA)	Inglis	Minnick
Cooper	Inslee	Mitchell
Costa	Israel	Mollohan
Costello	Issa	Moore (KS)
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)
Crenshaw	Jackson-Lee	Moran (KS)
Crowley	(TX)	Moran (VA)
Cuellar	Jenkins	Murphy (CT)
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (NY)
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Dahlkemper	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Tim
Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Myrick
Davis (CA)	Jones	Nadler (NY)

Napolitano	Ross	Sullivan
Neal (MA)	Rothman (NJ)	Sutton
Neugebauer	Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Nunes	Royce	Tauscher
Nye	Ruppersberger	Taylor
Oberstar	Rush	Teague
Obey	Ryan (OH)	Terry
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Oliver	Salazar	Thompson (MS)
Ortiz	Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (PA)
Pallone	T.	Thornberry
Pastor (AZ)	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiahrt
Paul	Sarbanes	Tiberi
Paulsen	Scalise	Tierney
Payne	Schakowsky	Titus
Pence	Schauer	Tonko
Perlmutter	Schiff	Towns
Perriello	Schmidt	Tsongas
Peters	Schock	Turner
Peterson	Schrader	Upton
Petri	Schwartz	Van Hollen
Pingree (ME)	Scott (GA)	Velázquez
Pitts	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Walden
Poe (TX)	Serrano	Walz
Polis (CO)	Sessions	Wamp
Pomeroy	Sestak	Wasserman
Posey	Shadegg	Schultz
Price (GA)	Shea-Porter	Waters
Price (NC)	Sherman	Watson
Putnam	Shimkus	Watt
Quigley	Shuler	Waxman
Radanovich	Shuster	Weiner
Rahall	Simpson	Welch
Rangel	Sires	Westmoreland
Rehberg	Skelton	Wexler
Reichert	Slaughter	Whitfield
Reyes	Smith (NE)	Wilson (OH)
Richardson	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rodriguez	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Roe (TN)	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Rogers (AL)	Snyder	Woolsey
Rogers (KY)	Souder	Wu
Rogers (MI)	Space	Yarmuth
Rohrabacher	Speier	Young (AK)
Rooney	Spratt	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	
Roskam	Stupak	

NOT VOTING—9

Capito	Deal (GA)	Murtha
Capuano	Fortenberry	Pascarell
Conyers	Hill	Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left for the vote.

□ 1554

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, due to events in my congressional district, I was unable to vote today. If I were present, I would have voted in favor of the following bills: H. Res. 299, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 4 through 10, 2009; H. Res. 338, supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College Month; H. Res. 353, supporting the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Days.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1728, MORTGAGE REFORM AND ANTI-PREDATORY LENDING ACT

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-96) on the resolution (H. Res. 400) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1728) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to reform consumer mortgage practices and provide accountability for such practices, to provide certain minimum standards for consumer mortgage loans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT RELATING TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY FOR THE APPLICATION OF SAFEGUARDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-37)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a list of the sites, locations, facilities, and activities in the United States that I intend to declare to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), under the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America, with Annexes, signed at Vienna on June 12, 1998 (the "U.S.-IAEA Additional Protocol"), and constitutes a report thereon, as required by section 271 of Public Law 109-401. In accordance with section 273 of Public Law 109-401, I hereby certify that:

(1) each site, location, facility, and activity included in the list has been examined by each department and agency with national security equities with respect to such site, location, facility, or activity; and

(2) appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that information of direct national security significance will not be compromised at any such site, location, facility, or activity in connection with an IAEA inspection.

The enclosed draft declaration lists each site, location, facility, and activity I intend to declare to the IAEA, and provides a detailed description of such sites, locations, facilities, and activities, and the provisions of the U.S.-IAEA Additional Protocol under which they would be declared. Each site, location, facility, and activity would be declared in order to meet the obligations of the United States of America with respect to these provisions.

The IAEA classification of the enclosed declaration is "Highly Confidential Safeguards Sensitive"; however, the United States regards this information as "Sensitive but Unclassified."

Nonetheless, under Public Law 109-401, information reported to, or otherwise acquired by, the United States Government under this title or under the U.S.-IAEA Additional Protocol shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 2009.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1600

CROSS-BORDER CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRIFFITH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one of the most important things taking place in our country, and that is the battle on the second front. I am not talking about the war in Afghanistan or the war in Iraq, but I am talking about the battle that is fought daily on the southern border of the United States with Mexico and those people that try to come into the United States illegally. I call it the border wars.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about that crime comes into the United States from the south, from all countries, through Mexico. And then we hear that it is not really a problem. Sometimes it is very difficult for us to know exactly what the truth is. It always tends to be based upon who is giving us that information.

Recently, I was down on the Texas-Mexico border. I visited with numerous of our sheriffs and I asked them this question: How many people do you have in your county jail that are charged with crimes in your county? I am not talking about people being held on immigration violations, just people in jail charged with misdemeanors or felonies. And so the different sheriffs gave me the information that I would like to relate to you tonight.

We will start off in far west Texas, in El Paso, a large population. The Sheriff's Department says: About 18 percent of the people in our county jail are foreign nationals in the United States legally, illegally, charged with crimes, misdemeanors or felonies.

You move next door to Hudspeth County, a vast county the size of Connecticut and Rhode Island, not very many sheriff's deputies in that county. Sheriff Arvin West says: 90 percent of the people in my county jail are foreign nationals.

Moving on down the Rio Grande River toward the Gulf of Mexico, Culberson County Sheriff Carrillo, 22 percent. The three next counties, Jeff Davis, Presidio, and Brewster Counties did not have information that they could furnish me, so I will move on down the river and talk about the other ones.

Val Verde County, 39 percent of the people in the county jail are foreign nationals; Kinney County, 71 percent, foreign nationals; Maverick County, 65 percent; Dimmit County, 45 percent; Webb County, that is where Laredo is, 45 percent are foreign nationals; Zapata County, 65 percent; Starr County, 53 percent; Hidalgo County, 23 percent; and then Cameron County, down on the Mexico-Texas border that buttresses the Gulf of Mexico, is 28 percent.

You can make statistics prove whatever you want them to, Mr. Speaker, but those are a lot of people in American jails from foreign countries that have been charged with committing crimes in this country. That is one reason, maybe the primary reason, why we need to protect the sanctity of the border.

We talk about border security. We are spending money on border security. We are sending a lot of money down to Mexico to spend on border security. But the truth of the matter is cross-traveler crime is still being committed, and people are committing crimes in American counties who are foreign nationals, and it is time the United States realize this truth and secure the border.

A lot of these people are charged with drug crimes, the drug cartels, drug runners. Many of those people in our jails are those individuals. We are learning now that there is a new effort to build tunnels into the United States, not just over in California, but in Texas and Arizona, as well, where needed.

So, obviously, the sheriffs in these counties need help, and we need everybody working on the border, all the Federal agencies, the Border Patrol, the ATF, the DEA, we need all of them. Plus, we need the locals who patrol the whole county. Unlike the Border Patrol that only patrols the first 35 miles inland, the county sheriffs patrol the vastness of the county.

So what can they do about it? There are a couple of programs that we need to help the sheriffs be involved in. One of those is they can get from the Department of Defense used equipment, equipment that has been used by our military, and all they have to do is repair it and they can use that equipment. We are talking about Humvees. We are talking about trucks. We are talking about, even, helicopters. They can repair that equipment by sending it to the State penitentiary where those mechanics are that can repair it. They can also buy, at a low price, equipment that has been used occasionally, new or used equipment that is no longer used by our military.

So both of those things, we should encourage the sheriffs departments to use and to get that equipment. Because, you see, Mr. Speaker, the drug cartels have more money, they have more people, they have better equipment than we do on this side of the border, and that is one way we can enforce the security of the border.

We ought to also use the National Guard on the border. The border Governors have requested the use of the National Guard, and we should use the National Guard.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, I have met with the sheriffs from Brownsville all the way to San Diego, and they are in a group called the Southwest Border Sheriff's Coalition. There is 31 of these sheriffs, and they have asked, through me, to ask the President of the United States to meet with them so the sheriffs can tell the President firsthand what is taking place on the border from Brownsville, Texas, all the way to San Diego, California, and hopefully the President will do that. We need to protect the border. That is the first duty of government.

And that's just the way it is.

TOO MANY HAVE DIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent report from the Associated Press gave us a new and very grim reminder of the human cost of the conflict in Iraq.

According to the A.P., the Iraqi Government has secretly recorded over 87,000 killings since the year 2005. The A.P. also added its own statistics on the known number of deaths between 2003 and 2005.

When you add those numbers, you get over 110,000 Iraqi civilian deaths since the beginning of the American occupation. But, Mr. Speaker, the death toll is even higher than that. The A.P. said that an Iraqi official estimated the actual number of deaths to be 10 to 20 percent higher because of the thousands who are still missing and civilians who were buried in the chaos of war without official records.

Of course, the death toll itself does not measure the full human cost of the conflict. It doesn't include the injured. It doesn't include the children who have been orphaned. It doesn't include the families that have been devastated by the loss of their loved ones and their breadwinners. It doesn't include the suffering of the 4 million refugees. It doesn't include the countless deaths from indirect causes, which includes the lack of health care because hospitals were closed and so many doctors were forced to flee. And it doesn't include the people who have seen their futures taken away from them because of their schools and colleges being closed by the fighting. It is no surprise that the A.P. report said almost every person in Iraq has been touched by the violence.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, here in America we have seen 35,000 of our finest and bravest men and women killed or wounded in battle, and 140,000 of our troops remain in harm's way today.

Mr. Speaker, war is not a video game. Real people die or are horribly wounded and scarred, and they are scarred and wounded for life. Real families suffer. We need to remember that when we make momentous decisions about war and peace in this House, we have to consider those statistics.

Today, our country is faced with another tough decision about war: What to do about the situation in Afghanistan. I oppose the supplementary funding request for Iraq and Afghanistan. It will prolong our occupation of Iraq through at least the year 2011, and it will expand our military presence in Afghanistan indefinitely.

Instead of attempting to find military solutions to the problems we face in Iraq and Afghanistan, the administration must fundamentally change our mission in both countries to focus on promoting reconciliation, economic development, humanitarian aid, and regional diplomatic efforts.

Diplomacy and economic development are two of the cornerstones of my Smart Security Platform for the 21st century. This plan would employ the many effective nonmilitary tools that we have to fight terrorism. These tools will cost a lot less and be far more effective. They will save lives, stop terrorism, and keep us safe at the same time, or at least safer than a military option. I invite all of my colleagues to consider House Resolution 363, which describes the full plan.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the military option has taken us down the wrong road in both Iraq and Afghanistan for the past 7 years. The military option hasn't made us more secure. It has cost our Treasury over \$1 trillion so far, with no end in sight. And the human toll has been appalling. It is time to do something that will make our Nation safer and save countless lives. The smart security platform for the 21st century will achieve both of these goals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FORT LEAVENWORTH, A POOR FIT FOR GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in January, shortly after taking office, President Obama ordered the closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base within the year. Up to

250 detainees who are suspects from the war on terrorism will be processed and moved, possibly to facilities located inside the United States. The U.S. disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, is apparently one of the facilities under consideration to house these prisoners.

I have visited Fort Leavenworth, the city of Leavenworth, and surrounding communities. I have talked to city officials, local businesses, and State legislators. I have spoken to U.S. military officers and foreign military students attending the Army's Command and General Staff College located at the fort.

Simply stated, Fort Leavenworth is a poor fit for placing Guantanamo detainees. Fort Leavenworth is known as the "Intellectual Center of the Army," where the leaders of our military and foreign militaries are educated. However, should these politically sensitive detainees be located at the fort, many countries will likely discontinue sending military students to America to be trained. This action would disrupt Fort Leavenworth's primary mission of military education. It would greatly impair a successful international military student program that has spread good will around the world for 100 years.

Additionally, our country should not make Fort Leavenworth's soldiers and their families and northeast Kansas unfairly bear this responsibility at the cost of their safety and economic well-being. The 3,000 residents who live on post as well as the residents of nearby communities would be living at a higher security risk. Since the fort has no major medical facilities, dangerous detainees would need to be transported to a local hospital or V.A. for medical attention. Local public safety officials are not capable of handling a terrorist incident or protests that may occur and would require greater resources. The need to increase security at the fort would likely close off citizen access to Sherman Airfield, the only public airport in Leavenworth, as well as stop rail and river barge traffic that runs to the post. These actions would have significant economic consequences.

Finally, the fort's disciplinary barracks lack the capability to house terrorist suspects. It is largely a medium-security facility for military prisoners. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade the disciplinary barracks to maximum security level and to construct the hospital, residential, and support facilities that would be required to house the additional prisoners and security personnel. As a small post surrounded by a civilian population, there is no room to grow.

Fort Leavenworth is clearly an unsuitable location. I am a sponsor of legislation introduced by my colleague of Kansas, Ms. JENKINS, to prevent Guantanamo detainees from being relocated there.

□ 1615

The decision to close Guantanamo Bay detention facility and relocate terror suspects should not be made recklessly. I'm troubled that the administration is seeking to move forward on Guantanamo despite the absence of a closure and relocation plan and despite the lack of congressional review. In their recently submitted FY 09 war supplemental request to Congress, they ask us for \$80 million to close the Guantanamo detention facility to relocate prisoners, support personnel and services.

I join the gentleman from California, Representative HUNTER, in asking the Appropriations Committee not to include this funding in the supplemental until we see a plan. Still lacking these details this week, I'm pleased to see that our appropriations chairman, Mr. OBAY, announced his refusal to provide the funding.

This critical national security decision deserves critical thought. Detainees should not be moved where they do not belong. And detainees do not belong at Fort Leavenworth.

JUVENILE JUSTICE IMPROVEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that I recently introduced, along with several cosponsors, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act.

Mr. Speaker, every day in America, 90,000 youth are incarcerated in our juvenile correctional facilities. Seventy percent of these youth are held for noncriminal acts like running away or violating curfew. Instead of working with these youth and these families to identify the root of their problem and help them find alternatives to their negative behavior, our policy in too many places around this country is to simply lock them up. Even more shocking, 7,500 of our Nation's young people sit in adult jails on any given day, even though study after study has proven that that practice of putting youth in adult facilities only increases the likelihood of recidivism and puts them at risk amongst that sometimes very dangerous adult population.

Sadly, these are not the only consequences of putting juveniles in the adult system. Keeping children safe in the adult juvenile justice system is extremely difficult. All too often, physical and sexual assault become commonplace. According to the Department of Justice's statistics division, 21 percent and 13 percent of all substantiated victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence in jails in 2005 and 2006 respectively were youth under the age of 18. That number is disturbingly high when you take into account that juveniles account for only 1 percent of all

inmates. Thirteen percent of all sexual violence in our prisons is against these young people. They represent 1 percent of the total population. Moreover, and not surprisingly, youth have the highest rate of suicide in our jails. And as we know too well in Connecticut, placing juveniles with adults only exacerbates that problem.

However, I'm hopeful that with this legislation, H.R. 1873, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act, we can start to reverse these dangerous trends.

Mr. Speaker, by keeping youth out of the adult criminal justice system and by using rehabilitative programs and services that are proven to try to help stop that cycle of crime, youth involved in these systems can emerge as proactive, positive and productive members of our community and of our workforce.

Specifically, this bill would protect youth prosecuted as adults from being held in adult jails or lockups while awaiting trial except in very limited circumstances. In these limited circumstances, youth prosecuted as adults must be sight and sound separated from adults in that facility to help protect their safety. Fortunately, some States already allow youth who have been convicted as adults to serve their sentence in juvenile correctional facilities. H.R. 1873 would remove a provision in current law that penalizes these States for choosing to house youth convicted as adults in more appropriate settings while not endangering other youth in the facility.

The Juvenile Justice Improvement Act would also work to keep youth out of locked facilities for noncriminal status offenses like running away or violating curfew. It would do this by closing a loophole in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

This vital legislation would also encourage States to take steps to eliminate the use of dangerous practices such as choking youth or restraining them to fixed objects for the purpose of coercion, punishment or the convenience of staff. These steps would include collecting data on the use of these dangerous practices in prisons, providing training to staff on effective behavior management and creating an independent monitoring system to oversee conditions across the country at juvenile facilities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act would reward States through incentive grants that are implementing ideas that are research and evidence based. Such reforms would include making juvenile justice facilities safer based on this research, improving public safety in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents based on research, and better addressing the mental health needs of juvenile justice inmates based on research.

Mr. Speaker, these changes to the juvenile justice system are critical to ensure that all of our youth become law-abiding, contributing members of society. There is not always political util-

ity in government to stand up for youthful offenders, Mr. Speaker. It is not an easy thing for Members of this House or State legislatures to stand up and fight for.

But we need to fight for these kids under the age of 18 who may have made a mistake, maybe a big mistake, to try to give them a second chance or at the very least to try to make sure that when they are in prison, when they are locked up behind bars that they are safe from the ravages that can be associated with incarceration. If we can do those things, we are a better Congress and we are a better society.

With that, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1873.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LONE WOLF HUNTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the statements written as part of an assessment by the Department of Homeland Security classifying disgruntled veterans as a threat to U.S. security and potential recruits for right-wing extremist groups. The report was distributed among law enforcement agencies throughout the country earlier this week. When I was back home in San Diego, our El Cajon police department had actually gotten this memorandum classifying me. Because I served three tours overseas with the United States Marine Corps, two in Iraq in Operation Iraqi Freedom and one in Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom, I am a possible terrorist.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go over some stuff with this DHS memorandum. It is the "Right-wing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment." And here is a picture of it here. This is an actual Department of Homeland Security memorandum that went out to every local, State and Federal law enforcement agency in the entire country.

I would just like to go over a few points of it. It first starts off by saying that "the Department of Homeland Security Office of Intelligence and Analysis has no specific information that domestic right-wing terrorists are currently planning acts of violence." So they don't have any evidence for anything, but they are still going to call people like me possible "terrorists."

We read further down: "The possible passage of new restrictions on firearms and the return of military veterans fac-

ing significant challenges reintegrating into their communities could lead to the potential emergence of terrorist groups or lone wolf extremists capable of carrying out violent attacks."

I wasn't paranoid before, Mr. Speaker, but if we are going to pass new regulations on firearms, we are going to change the Second Amendment. And the fact that I would like to keep my own guns and that I'm a veteran who has served, that makes me a possible terrorist, as stated by our own government, by our own administration.

I read further down: right-wing extremism—and by the way, it is interesting that they don't talk about left-wing extremism or liberal extremism or progressivists. It is just right-wing extremism, and that is okay to talk about. It is okay to scorn those people that are right wing. They aren't as American as everybody else. "Right-wing extremism in the United States can be broadly divided into those groups, movements and adherents that are primarily hate oriented," I'm quoting here from this memo, "those that are mainly anti-government, rejecting Federal authority in favor of State or local authority." That means every single one of our Founding Fathers was a possible terrorist because they believed in local authority. They believed in States' rights. They didn't want an all-encompassing, dominating Federal Government.

It also includes groups of individuals that are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration. I'm quoting again.

So I'm pro-border security. I think that illegal immigration is called "illegal immigration" because, well, it is illegal. That once more makes me a possible terrorist. I'm pro-life. That makes me a possible terrorist too.

I keep reading down: "Returning veterans possess combat skills." That is me. I possess combat skills. So do millions of other Americans that have served in our Armed Forces since 2001—"combat skills and experience that are attractive to right-wing extremists."

The DHS, our own government, is concerned that right-wing extremists, I guess that's me, will attempt to recruit and radicalize returning veterans in order to boost their violent capabilities.

That sounds pretty scary. I must be pretty scary. I wonder if DHS is on their way here to get me right now. I will stay here and wait for them for a little bit longer.

I read further down: "Many right-wing extremists are agnostic toward the new Presidential administration and its perceived stance on a range of issues, including immigration and citizenship, the expansion of social programs"—that is a new one. If you don't like the expansion of social programs, you're a possible terrorist, too—"and restrictions on firearms ownership and use." If you weren't paranoid before, you ought to be getting paranoid now.

I will keep reading: "Right-wing extremists were concerned during the 1990s with the perception that illegal immigrants were taking away American jobs through their willingness to work at significantly lower wages. They also opposed free trade agreements, arguing that these arrangements resulted in Americans losing jobs to other countries." Are Americans not losing jobs to China, to Communist China, to India and to Mexico? If you believe that American jobs are worth fighting for, then you're a terrorist.

HONORING THE CREW OF THE APOLLO 11 MISSION TO THE MOON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I introduce legislation today to award the Congressional Gold Medal to four brave and exemplary Americans, Commander Neil A. Armstrong, command module pilot Michael Collins, and lunar module pilot Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, the crew of the 1969 Apollo 11 mission to the Moon. Additionally, this legislation would award a Congressional Gold Medal to John Glenn, the first American to orbit the Earth and the man who helped set NASA firmly on the path of human space exploration.

Forty years ago, 500 million people watched as Armstrong took those fateful steps on the Moon's surface, the first time that humans had ever set foot on another world. In words that were as poetic as the occasion was meaningful, Armstrong said, "That is one small step for man and one great leap for mankind." He was shortly followed thereafter on the Moon's surface by Aldrin as Collins circled overhead.

I was 11 years old that day, and I watched the Moon landing, joining much of humanity in celebrating this tremendous collective accomplishment. My family was on vacation, but I persuaded my parents to let me stay in the hotel room alone all day and watch television so that I could see these giant men take those giant steps. Their mission was a landmark for America, for the world, and for all time. Americans are still inspired by these men and their mission to travel over a quarter of a million miles of dead space to reach our closest celestial neighbor. I remember at the time thinking that humankind as a species is capable of true greatness. And while wolves howl at the Moon, humans visit it.

On this journey, the Apollo 11 crew showed remarkable bravery, protected for days from the lifeless vacuum by only a thin metal shell. They collected more than 40 pounds of lunar samples, took photographs and deployed experiments to study the solar wind, lunar dust, enable laser ranging and forever carry out passive seismic measure-

ments that remain measurable to this day.

Their footprints remain on the Moon today and forever. The entire endeavor was a culmination of an intensive effort by tens of thousands of scientists, engineers and other dedicated individuals to meet the challenge laid down by President John F. Kennedy 8 years earlier. President Kennedy encouraged Americans to rise to challenges like this one, and the American people responded with ingenuity, discipline and a spirit of collective effort. This journey took political will, scientific and technological risk-taking, inspiration and the heart and soul of millions of Americans who supported this space program.

□ 1630

And it took the competence and courage of these men, Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins, to make Apollo 11 the success that it was.

As the culmination of the U.S.-Soviet space race that commenced with the Soviet's launch of Sputnik in 1957, Apollo 11's success signified the United States' ability to establish pre-eminence in space.

It also helped to inspire a generation to pursue careers in science and engineering, and to believe in the power of American society and American culture. Alone in that hotel room watching TV, I certainly felt a lasting sense of meaning, that connection to those three brave astronauts.

These astronauts represented in that moment America's destiny, a destiny shared by the thousands of men and women who worked to make it happen.

This includes John Glenn, of course, another brave pioneer of human space exploration who had made their journey possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that on this 40th anniversary year of the Apollo 11 mission, we grant these four brave Americans the recognition only this Congress can bestow, the Congressional Gold Medal. That's why I am introducing legislation to that effect today.

I am pleased to be joined in this initiative by the chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, Bart Gordon; the chairwoman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, Gabrielle Giffords; Committee Ranking Member Ralph Hall; Subcommittee Ranking Member Pete Olson; and Florida Members Suzanne Kosmas and Bill Posey.

I believe this recognition is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so it can be enacted into law.

HONORING JACK KEMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago America lost

one of its greatest patriots, and I mean that. Jack Kemp served in this body, and I had the pleasure of knowing him for a long, long time.

He started out his career, as far as I can remember, as a football player. He was at San Diego where he played. As I understand it, the football team out there really didn't think he had what it took to become a starting quarterback, and they sold him to the Buffalo Bills for \$500, I believe. He always laughed about that. And for \$500, the Buffalo Bills got an all-star quarterback. They won several conference titles in the AFC, and he was an All Pro. Jack Kemp was all pro his whole life. When he ran for Congress and came to this Chamber, everyone who knew him and met him knew immediately he would become one of our leaders. He became our conference chairman and a leader in so many ways. Ronald Reagan tapped him to work with him on cutting taxes, which stimulated the longest period of economic growth in our country's history. Jack Kemp, along with Mr. Roth in the Senate, wrote the Kemp-Roth bill, which was the catalyst for the economic recovery under the Reagan administration.

Jack Kemp was a lot of fun to be with. He wasn't just a stuffy guy. He was the kind of guy that you liked to be around, an all-American person as well as an all-American football player and all-American political leader.

He ran for Vice President with Bob Dole, and I truly believe he would have been an outstanding Vice President had he been elected. I also campaigned for him up in New Hampshire when he was running for President. I will never forget the Styrofoam footballs with his name that he threw to us on the plane. I think it was in January, and it was so cold. The thing I remember the most was Jack put me on a plane. He had three planeloads of congressmen, and the only one that didn't have heat was the one I was on. But he was worth it. He was worth campaigning door to door, store to store in New Hampshire because he would have been an outstanding President.

I came down tonight to pay homage to a good friend whom we will all miss, a man who was a great American, a great father and husband, and he is somebody who will be missed by not only the people in this Chamber and the other Chamber and the White House, but he will be missed by everybody in America who knew him. He was a great, great man.

I just want to say to Joanne and his four children, You have our deepest sympathy. Everybody in this body sends their best regards to you and their sympathy to you for this very trying time you are going through.

If anyone gets to heaven, Jack will be up there, and he probably has a football in his hands. I can't wait to see him again.

UYGHUR TERRORISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor again to raise the awareness of the American people and of the Congress that the safety of the United States could be put at risk should Attorney General Eric Holder approve the release of trained terrorists into our country. I repeat, released into this country, not held in jails, but let free in our neighborhoods and our communities.

Eric Holder expects us to take his word that the detainees are not a threat, and that is unacceptable. The Attorney General expects this Congress to sit idly by and the American people to sit idly by until he announces he has released the Uyghurs held at Guantanamo Bay into the United States, into your neighborhood. In fact, he will not allow career FBI and government employees to even brief Members of Congress on this. So much for this administration's promise of transparency and accountability.

Let me be clear: These detainees are trained terrorists who were caught in camps affiliated with Al Qaeda. Those who would use terror are terrorists no matter their intended target. There have been published reports that these terrorists were members of the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Movement, ETIM, a designated terrorist organization affiliated with Al Qaeda.

The detainees held at Guantanamo Bay are trained terrorists. They were trained in facilities affiliated with Al Qaeda and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of 9/11 who took pleasure in beheading Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl.

Last month, the U.S. Treasury froze the assets of Abdul Haq, the leader of the ETIM. The Treasury Department targeted Haq as part of their efforts to shut down the Al Qaeda support network.

So here Treasury designates Haq as a terrorist, and Eric Holder wants to release the members of the terrorist group to walk the streets.

Upon making the designation, the Treasury Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence said, "Abdul Haq commands a terror group that sought to sow violence and fracture international unity at the 2008 Olympic games in China."

What if our people had not picked up these terrorists and they had gotten their training and had gone back to China and had blown up one of the Olympic facilities when many American citizens were there? What if? How is it that the U.S. Treasury Department can declare that this is a terrorist group that "sought to sow violence" while the U.S. Justice Department asserts that members of the same group caught at terrorist training camps and held for 7 years at Guantanamo should be released free and clear

into the United States, yet this Congress and the American people are left in the dark about the administration's plans to release the detainees?

If the Congress doesn't really care and want to hold oversight hearings, certainly the American people have a right to know who the Attorney General is asking to place in their communities.

Last Friday, I called on this administration to declassify and provide the American people with information regarding the capture, the detention, and the threat assessment of each detainee they intend to release inside the United States. Regardless of their intended targets of terror, the American people deserve to know whether they have been further radicalized due to their exposure to Al Qaeda leaders like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. They have been down in Guantanamo with some of the most violent people that have ever walked the Earth. And now, after the radicalization that may have taken place, Eric Holder now wants to release them into our neighborhoods and into our communities.

I worry about the impact these released Uyghurs will have on our national security. I have talked with several former members who have worked in our intelligence community, and to a person they all believe that this will be dangerous for the United States. They all said, what message does their release into the United States send to Al Qaeda and other terrorist networks?

How can Attorney General Holder guarantee that the released Uyghurs will not stay in contact with Al Qaeda and provide them with intelligence within the U.S.? Has Eric Holder never heard of radicalization in prison? Some people go into prison and come out worse than they go in. If the Attorney General cannot or will not answer these questions, he should not consider releasing them.

I ask you, please, the American people need to have all of this information before a decision is made.

EAST TURKISTAN ISLAMIC PARTY APPEALS FOR NEW RECRUITS IN NEW VIDEO

The militant Islamist group East Turkistan Islamic Party (ETIM) released a new propaganda video, in which it appealed to Muslims in Turkistan to join the group's camps in Waziristan, Pakistan.

The 43-minute video is entitled "Persistence and preparation for Jihad" and was produced by the group's media wing Sawt al Islam.

It includes a statement by the group's current leader Sheikh Abul Haq, as well as its late leader Hassan Makhdum, whose alias is Abu Mohammed al Turkistani. Abul Haq said "jihad" was a duty that falls on all Muslims just like any other religious duty. He also pledged more attacks against Chinese forces. "The operations of the Islamic Turkistani Party will make China experience the same taste of shame and defeat that America has experienced in Iraq and Afghanistan," Abul Haq said.

Footage from the group's training camp showed a group of militants undergoing training under the supervision of military commander identified as Seifullah. Once again, he claimed credit for the bus bomb-

ings and the attack on the police station in Shanghai and Yunnan in May and July of 2008.

The attacks seem to have been carried out using remotely-defonated explosives devices. Footage shown on the video showed a member of the group placing the explosives in a small suitcase and covering it with some cloths, while having a radio detonator in his hand.

Seifullah also made an appeal to Turkistani Muslims to join the group's camps in Waziristan and train on the latest weapons used by the Chinese army's ground forces. He said that the group is currently trying to develop a training program on other weapons used by the army.

The East Turkistan Islamic Movement is a militant group that advocates the creation of an independent, Islamic state of East Turkistan, formally part of Afghanistan, in what is currently the Xinjiang region of China.

The group is thought to have links with al Qaeda. In its 2005 report on terrorism, the U.S. State Department said that the group was "linked to al Qaeda and the international jihadist movement" and that al Qaeda provided the group with "training and financial assistance".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

U.S. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address the House today in what is the first of what will be many conversations amongst the new Members of Congress and our observations as to where we are going in this Congress, some of our observations as to the economic conditions and the policies that have gotten us to where we are.

I would like to thank the Speaker and the majority leader and the majority whip for giving me this opportunity and for giving my fellow classmates, the new members of the Democratic class, the opportunity to come here today and talk for just a little while about what I believe to be the most pressing issue in the United States, and that is the foreclosure crisis and the lending crisis that has led us into this recession.

We would like to talk about some of the reasons we got there. We would like to talk about some of the actions

that have been taken since the Democrats have regained control of Congress in order to address the foreclosure crisis. But we have heard much rhetoric over the years about why we are where we are in terms of this economic crisis.

I spent 8 years in the State legislature in Ohio, and I will be joined shortly by a former colleague in the State legislature in Ohio. We have seen Ohio hit hard by the foreclosure crisis.

Just today in the Cincinnati Inquirer, my hometown newspaper, out of our 52 neighborhoods in Cincinnati, it stated in 33 of those neighborhoods, over 10 percent of all houses currently sit vacant. That is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker. But unfortunately, that tragedy is playing out again and again and again across the United States.

So we are going to spend a little time in conversation with my Democratic colleagues discussing how we got here and what the impacts are, what the impacts are to our constituents, what the impacts are to American families across the country who are currently suffering under the weight of this foreclosure crisis.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) to talk a little about his observations in northern Ohio.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and greater Cincinnati area who has done extraordinary work in the Ohio legislature to try and remedy the situation where we find so many families struggling and so many families trying to live the American Dream of owning their own home and having a job to pay for their mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, what we have found over the last several years is that the housing crisis is at the epicenter of the economic downturn that we are experiencing in this country. Make no mistake, today's great recession is rooted right here in the housing crisis that we find so many families plagued with, and especially across Ohio.

But the irony here is that the success of our communities actually begins at home.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS) and I know, after studying this issue for a long time, we worked on the predatory lending bill that passed through the State legislature in Ohio, and he is assigned to the Financial Services Committee here in the Congress, to try to remedy this situation for average families back home in Ohio.

Now let's talk about those average families. We hail from the Buckeye State. Buckeyes. Bob and Betty Buckeye go to the local community bank. They take out a mortgage to live to that dream of American homeownership. They take out a mortgage. They go to work. They punch a time clock and play by the rules. Maybe they put their kid in college. That bank sells their mortgage three, four, five times down the road. I don't know, Mr.

Speaker, maybe that violates the spirit of the Truth in Lending Act. What happens is after this mortgage is sold three, four, five times, they have no idea who owns it.

□ 1645

And they send their mortgage off every month because they get the bill in. And what happens? Bob and Betty Buckeye begin to feel the economic pinch. They begin to see that the job market is starting to erode. All of a sudden, Bob loses his job and can't make his home mortgage payment. So what does he do?

He goes down to the local bank where he took out the loan and says, "Mr. Lender, give me a couple of extra days. I need a couple of extra days just to make this mortgage payment."

He says, "Well, Mr. Buckeye, we don't own your mortgage anymore."

He says, "Well, who owns it? I took the loan out from you."

What happens is that many, many of our constituents are finding that their home mortgage from Ohio is now off in California or Texas or some other State, and we don't have the opportunity to work with our local community banks to renegotiate this or have that extra month or 2 months. Automatically these things go into foreclosure. You've seen this in Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Reclaiming the time, Mr. Speaker, and as the Congressman noted, we both worked on predatory lending legislation in the State of Ohio. I should mention, we initiated those efforts back in 2001 and in 2002, the same type of efforts that were initiated right here in the United States Congress by our Democratic members here in the United States Congress.

Unfortunately, to this day, we do not have Federal predatory lending legislation that has become law in the United States. I think that is a tragedy for our country because, as you have described, Congressman, is how it has played out across the country.

I served on the Governor's Foreclosure Task Force in the State of Ohio. What you observed in terms of Bob and Betty Buckeye—and I like the name—but what you observed played out over and over again. We found that the vast majority of these mortgages were in the subprime market.

That term is tossed around a lot—these subprime loans. Well, subprime loans are simply loans made to families who have already shown that they have difficulty making payments. That's why they are considered to be subprime—that they have difficulty in terms of their credit report, they have difficulty in terms of their credit history in making payments.

So what happened? As you described, we saw these financial entities—not necessarily State-run banks, not necessarily depositories—but we saw these financial entities come into the State of Ohio, and we saw this over and over again in multitudes of States, where

they would make loans available. Sometimes it was no money down, sometimes it was no-doc loans. That is, you didn't have to show any documentation as to your annual income. Yet the folks still qualified for the loan.

Well, how did that happen? Because it used to be, as you know, Congressman, that you would go into the local bank or you would go into the local savings and loan and you would ask for a mortgage loan. And they would come out and appraise your house. And the risk associated with that mortgage loan would be held by you and it would be held by the bank. And they would hold that paper in their portfolio. It was a long-term investment for that financial institution.

But as you described is how it played out. With the development of these secondary markets and the securitization of mortgages across the country, what we saw was very interesting behavior. So that no longer was it the financial entity that was closing the loan that was carrying the risk, but they immediately transferred that risk onto a secondary market. They sold the loan.

The loan was then securitized in a mortgage-backed security on Wall Street and sold to an international investor, sold to a pension fund. So there was no risk at the front end of the closing of the loan. It incentivized all kinds of behaviors. So people who should not have qualified for loans were qualifying for loans. And, very interestingly, the loan products that they were qualifying for were very predatory in nature. Many of these loans, we came to find out, were adjustable rate mortgages—mortgages that had teaser rates up front, but 2 years into the loan, 3 years into the loan, the mortgage rate would adjust. It may adjust in certain cases every 4 months, every 6 months. And you often found the family wanting to get out of that loan, wanting to refinance, but they were unable to do so because of this little instrument contained in almost every one of these loans called a prepayment penalty.

So think about it. You've got a family who has a poor credit history, who has difficulty paying off their debts, now finding themselves with a mortgage that used to be affordable. Say it was \$700. Now all of a sudden that mortgage is \$1,200 after the rate has started to adjust. They want to get out, but this prepayment penalty of maybe \$2,000 or \$5,000 stops them from refinancing.

So they are trapped. They are trapped in a loan that they cannot get out of, and it just repeats itself over and over again when it comes to foreclosures.

I will yield to the Congressman.

Mr. BOCCIERI. So, Representative DRIEHAUS, let me get this straight. Those constituents of ours, Bob and Betty Buckeye, that get those flyers in the mail saying they can get a free vacation if they refinanced their house,

they can send some money to their kids who are in college, those are predatory in nature, am I right, because there's no skin in the game? They're asking constituents to sign away for 30 years or 15 years on a mortgage.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. They were absolutely predatory in nature. Time and time again, there were those of us in State legislatures across the country who called out to our Congress and said, Look, you have the ability to regulate these entities. You have the ability to crack down on predatory lending.

The Republicans in Congress at the time—or the Republicans now—are engaging in revisionist history, where they want to blame the CRA—the Community Reinvestment Act—or they want to blame Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac for the foreclosure crisis, and they seem to forget that they were elected in 1994 and they held the majority in 1995, in 1996, in 1997, in 1998, in 1999, in 2000, in 2001, in 2002, in 2003, in 2004, in 2005, all the way until the election in 2006.

As this chart demonstrates, we saw the growth of these in early 2000. That's when you saw many initiatives. You saw legislation introduced right here on the floor of this Congress in 2000, trying to address this problem.

But the Republicans would have none of it. They said the market will take care of it. The market will address the situation.

We saw in 2003, 734,000 foreclosures. That number, as staggering as it is, in 2003, by 2008 had grown to almost 2.5 million foreclosures across the United States.

I think it's important—and our colleague from Florida is about to join us, as is another colleague from Ohio—but I think it's important when you talk about the true cost of foreclosures, the cost is not simply with the family that is being foreclosed upon, but it's to everybody in the neighborhood.

I have a house two doors down from me that was foreclosed on. That hurts my property value. It hurts the property value of my neighbor across the street. But when you see a multitude of foreclosures and vacancies across a neighborhood, then you see deterioration in the schools. It hurts small businesses. It hurts the entire fabric of the community as you see increasing crime and as you see local governments having to pay the cost of upkeep on those properties.

I will now yield to my colleague from Columbus, Ohio, Congresswoman KILROY.

Ms. KILROY. Thank you so much, Congressman DRIEHAUS. I have been listening to what you have been saying about the impact of this foreclosure crisis on Ohio, and you are absolutely right. When you talk about the impact of these large numbers of foreclosures on communities, we know that a single foreclosure can devastate neighboring homes and the surroundings.

On average, we are told that when a home enters foreclosure, its value im-

mediately plummets, on average, \$58,759. It hurts the neighborhood as well because when that lower price, that lower sales price, that lower valuation hits the books, it hurts the value of the entire neighborhood.

Every time you see a foreclosure, if it's in your neighborhood, your house or my house or our neighbors' houses are going down in value. That also has an impact on our local governments. We know that local governments are hurt as well in this economic downturn. They are finding it harder to protect neighborhoods against arson or squatting or other criminal activity.

So the foreclosure crisis hurts that family, it hurts the neighborhood, but it also hurts all of us in terms of the increase in criminal activity. Vacant and abandoned properties impose high costs on our local communities. Local jurisdictions and our school districts feel the impact of that lost tax revenue from those properties. Our cities are bearing the cost of municipal services, increased code enforcement, boarding things up, trying to find money to demolish homes and other properties that are vacant and declared to be nuisances.

All of these are problems associated with addressing the issue of vacant and abandoned properties, particularly in our city neighborhoods. But it's not just in the cities. It ripples out. It affects our entire State. It affects, in my area, the entire central Ohio community.

So we understand, as you have said so clearly, that in the last 8 years during the Bush administration, and particularly during the 6 years when the Republicans controlled Congress, there wasn't the necessary action that needed to be taken to stem the tide of foreclosures and protect the rest of us from the impact that foreclosures had on the greater economy, the effect in the financial markets because of the securitizing of mortgages, and to protect all of us from the subprime lending that was at the core of this foreclosure issue and this foreclosure problem.

Every day when I drive through my community, I find that there are more and more foreclosed homes, more and more For Sale signs and, according to a recent Associated Press analysis, my county, the largest county in my district, has the unfortunate ranking of number one nationally for neighborhoods with the largest percentage of vacant homes. This is a problem that hurts all of us.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. If the gentlelady would yield, we have been talking about the impact of the foreclosure crisis and the mortgage lending crisis in the State of Ohio. But we are joined now by Congressman GRAYSON from Florida. As you know, Florida has been hit hard by this economic crisis as well.

I would like to yield some time to Congressman GRAYSON to share his thoughts on the foreclosure crisis.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you very much. I appreciate that from the Congressman from Ohio. I will tell you that one of the most hard-hit areas of our entire country in terms of foreclosures, dropping housing values, and a general destruction of the economy, is Florida. In particular central Florida, which I represent.

In central Florida, the economy is based on three things: Tourism, housing, and senior services. Tourism is not doing well. Senior services is just barely getting by. But housing has been crushed by the dramatic decline in property values and this plague of foreclosures that we see all over central Florida, but in particular, in the epicenter of that earthquake, which is Orlando.

In Orlando, we have the highest home vacancy rate in the country. Almost 10 percent of the homes in Orlando are vacant. We have had extreme overbuilding and a problem that has been exacerbated terribly by foreclosures, which destroy entire neighborhoods.

What you have to understand about foreclosures is that they are fundamentally, economically irrational. As we heard before, every foreclosure results in losses of tens of thousands dollars to the mortgage holder, as well as putting a family out on the street. So you have to ask yourself: Why are the mortgage companies acting this way, and what can be done about it?

For those of us perhaps on the other side of the aisle who worship the free market, the god of the free market, you can look at the situation happening right now and you can see for yourself that our economic actors are acting irrationally by tossing people out on the street when there is an economic motivation to keep them in their homes and keep them paying. And that's what we saw over and over again in Florida.

We saw 30 percent, 40 percent losses being taken on houses, when people in those houses were employed, when people in those houses had income, when people in those houses had savings and the ability to keep paying, although they had missed a few payments already. In a situation like that, what do we gain by throwing people out on the street?

□ 1700

What benefit is that when the mortgage company takes a 30 or 40 percent loss, the homeowner has to move in with relatives or live in a car, and beyond that, the entire neighborhood is destroyed by foreclosure after foreclosure after foreclosure pervading the real estate market? What good is that?

Well, in Orlando, we have reached a solution that is at least a temporary solution for this problem. What we did is I asked our local State court chief judge to institute mandatory mediation in all foreclosure cases. So for 45 days, foreclosures in Orlando just stopped, stopped cold. We put everybody on timeout. The banks, the borrowers, the homeowners, everybody

was on timeout for 45 days. And you know what? People found a solution to their problems. In 45 days, we got the borrower, the homeowner and the bank together. We put them all together in a room with a mediator paid for by the bank.

Under this program, many people were able to keep their homes. All they needed, some of them, was just an extra couple of months to pay their bills, a little breathing space. That's all they needed. In some cases they needed a longer term on their loan, in some cases they needed to refinance and they hadn't cleared the paperwork yet, but time after time after time what we found is that with a little bit of breathing space people could end up keeping their homes—at least those that had an income, at least those that still had a job.

We did an enormous amount of good by this simple fix on foreclosures in Orlando. But it evokes a deeper question. The deeper question is, How did we get in this situation in the first place? What is it that led to this plague of foreclosures in the first place? And we all know the answer; the answer is predatory lending and housing fraud.

And for those across the aisle who want to cast the blame in this direction, I ask a simple question. The Bush administration was in charge of enforcing the law in this country for 8 years. Can you name me one person in that 8 years that was convicted of Federal housing fraud, just one? And I see a blank stare in response. Not one. Not one case can they identify of a single person who was enforced criminally in this country with violation of our housing laws, not one.

Now, our job is to pass the law. Our job is to pass a bill, send it to the Senate, take a Senate-passed bill, vote on it ourselves, and ask the President to sign it. That is what we do here, and we do oversight as well. But can we enforce the law? No. That is the responsibility of the executive branch. And I am telling you right now that for 8 years they did nothing. Nothing. And now they have the nerve to come to us and blame us for the problems that they created?

Mr. BOCCIERI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Congressman, you bring up several good points. And let's make sure that we have full disclosure here and big-picture stuff.

You know, the government shouldn't be so immersed in the market. But we set the goalpost, we set the out-of-bounds markers, and within the parameters of that we should allow the free market to work. But what was happening in that free market for the last 10 years? We had hedge fund operators betting on the price of fuel going up; we had folks who were investing and betting on the price of food going up—supermarket, you go into a supermarket, you see prices rising—and we

had hedge funds that were betting that people would not be able to pay their mortgage. Now, this was a recipe for disaster.

Congressman GRAYSON, you bring up valid points: Why was there no enforcement? Why were there no referees enforcing the out-of-bounds markers or the goalposts? Why were we not enforcing this? And why were we allowing families to lose their homes, lose the American Dream? And this notion that we don't have enough regulation, we don't have enforcement of the regulations is what is happening. And what we are finding is that families across this country are struggling because of that lack of enforcement.

Let me give you one example of a family in Ohio. Just last month, the RealtyTrac rated Stark County, the largest county in the 16th Congressional District, one of the counties in my district, among the worst in the Nation in foreclosure rates. The Canton-Massillon metropolitan area ranks near the top of that list: 6,400 foreclosures last year. One of those homeowners was Willie Campbell.

I met Ms. Campbell a couple weeks ago at a roundtable I put together back home to discuss these home foreclosure issues and find out how we could find some valuable solutions. Ms. Campbell was falling behind on her mortgage payments on her three-bedroom home in Stark County. She wanted to do the right thing. She wanted to remedy the problem. She is a good American. She called an 800 number listed on a TV commercial that promised to help her. Well, it didn't. In fact, it was a scam. They took money out of her bank account for 5 months.

Ms. Campbell turned to a community development organization for help. Through mediation, she received help to lower her monthly payments from more than \$850 to a little more than \$620. She was able to cut her interest rate from 9 to 5.6 percent. What's more is that community organizations like the one that she sought help from were able to negotiate a 3-month grace period so her mortgage payments would not be late and so that she could catch up on her bills.

Now, while Ms. Campbell was eventually able to find the help that she needed, more than 4,400 Stark County homeowners who filed for foreclosure last year were not so lucky. And what are those statistics, as Congressman DRIEHAUS suggested and Congresswoman KILROY from Ohio suggested? Ohio ranks at the top five States nationwide for the highest home foreclosure rates. We have found nationwide that home values have dropped 18 percent. Nearly one in five homeowners owes more than their home is worth. And each foreclosed property, as Congressman DRIEHAUS suggested, reduces the property value of neighbors by 9 percent.

We can do better. We have got to enforce the regulations. And that is why this Congress acted to make sure that

we have enforcement of the regulations that are out there so that these fly-by-night lenders and folks who are willing to sign on the other end of the table are brought into check and that we have some balance.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Thank you, Congressman. I just want to follow up on a point you made and a point that the Congressman from Florida made, and it's about the markets.

We have the best economic structure in the world. We have free market capitalism. And that allows for competition, it allows that competition to drive down prices, and that competition is what makes our economy grow. But when the markets don't work, when the markets have disruptions, it is our job, it is the job of government to intervene.

We are not elected to protect the barons on Wall Street, although if you sit on Financial Services, you would think that some Members are. But we are elected to protect the public good, protecting the public good.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go so far as to suggest that this economic crisis was precipitated by something called "predatory borrowing," as if the borrower has control, as if the borrower has control in the interaction in a mortgage loan, as if the bank is not allowed to say, you know what, you didn't give me the documentation as to your income, so therefore I am going to deny the loan.

We have folks on the other side of the aisle who have just closed their eyes to the crisis, saying the markets will take care of it. And I think that explains the inaction during the 1990s and in 2000 and 2001 and 2002 and 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006.

I had my staff pull some of the bills that were introduced in the House by the Democrats when the Republicans led the Congress. And in the 106th Congress you have both the Anti-Predatory Lending Act of 2000 as well as the Predatory Lending and Consumer Protection Act of 2000, didn't get a vote on the floor. In the 107th, the Protecting Our Communities From Predatory Lending Practices Act, no vote on the floor. The Predatory Mortgage Lending Practices Reduction Act, no vote on the floor. In the 108th Congress, the Predatory Mortgage Lending Practices Reduction Act, nothing. The Prevention of Predatory Lending Through Education Act, no action on the floor by the Republican-led Congress. Again, in the 108th, the Prohibit Predatory Lending Act, no action. And this happens over and over again every single year.

It wasn't until the Democrats took control of Congress that this Congress took seriously its role in regulating the markets when it comes to mortgages, when it understood that our primary objective, our primary purpose is to protect the public good.

This Congress failed the American people under Republican leadership

when it comes to housing. And it was only when the Democrats were elected in 2006 that we started to see action. But before I go through the number of steps that have been taken since 2007, when the Democrats took control, I would like to yield time to our colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO). So, Mr. TONKO, thank you for joining us.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative DRIEHAUS. I thank you for bringing us together on what is a very important topic.

You know, as we look at this very deep and long recession, far longer than some forecasted, we need to look at the root causes of yesterday that bring us to this point in history of today and how we are going to move forward.

I was very much interested in the chart that you shared with us earlier to look at the recent past history and the neglect that has caused such hardship in so many of the communities across this country. And, rightfully, it can be stated that this recession that we are currently enduring was pretty much triggered by the housing crisis, the mortgage crisis, the lending crisis, the foreclosure crisis. And as has been indicated by Representative KILROY, it impacts in several ways; and we can measure that in very interesting dynamics.

To think of the fact that one out of every 200 homes will be foreclosed upon is a very unraveling thought. That translates to some 3,000 people just in this capital city of Washington, D.C. alone. That is a tremendously difficult burden for communities. When you think of the fact that one child in every classroom in America is at risk of losing her or his home because the parents cannot pay for that mortgage, six in 10 homeowners that wish they understood the terms and details of their mortgages better. And the list goes on and on, all sorts of dynamics that really speak to the trouble that is out there and the impact that has been felt in our communities.

Any number of tipping points can cause this mortgage crisis or this foreclosure crisis. It can range from a job loss in this tough economy, to a health crisis that many families face, to previously missed mortgage payments—or certainly the lack of savings and access to credit, which has been another dynamic that has been dealt with and felt very severely by America's working families.

But on March 5 of this year, several of us—perhaps all of us in this colloquy—were able to stand up on this floor and pass H.R. 1106, the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act, which was our step forward, with the leadership of this House, with Speaker PELOSI determined to make a difference, with the Members of the majority looking to respond as there wasn't a response in the past, with the President and his administration looking to employ certain agencies to help resolve these crises.

We are going to move forward with a plan of action. And we need to make certain that more people are allowed to have a stable, affordable mortgage outcome. We need to work with agencies like the Department of Veteran Affairs and the Federal Housing Administration and the Department of Agriculture to allow people to modify their mortgages so that we can save the day for many homeowners. We need to expand the FHA's mortgage loan modification abilities so that, again, we can bring assistance to so many families.

Ms. KILROY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TONKO. Yes.

Ms. KILROY. I appreciate what you are saying. And after Representative DRIEHAUS laid out the problem of inaction and the impact that it had on our States, on our communities, and the large foreclosure crisis that has spilled over into the greater economy, what you are bringing up is that we now have a Congress that is ready to take action, take action to protect families, to protect communities, to address the issues that got us here into the sad state of affairs that we are; and the Making Homes Affordable Act, helping to stabilize our housing market, helping maybe 7 to 9 million Americans reduce their monthly mortgage payments to more affordable levels through refinancing, through workouts. And I am proud to have supported that kind of legislation, as I know you are and my colleagues. And I am happy to help people who contact my district office to find ways to learn about these programs and how they can learn whether it will help their particular situation.

I think it is great that these programs have gotten a lot of notice and a lot of publicity. But I am concerned that Representative BOCCIERI brought up the issue with the example of his constituent who got taken advantage of by somebody who pretends to help and is really hurting, and a whole new class of predators here springing up in Ohio—and probably in other States as well—taking advantage of somebody who went to them for help.

So I think it is really important that people, when they are working out their mortgages, work with their bank or go to an accredited housing counselor. And in central Ohio, there are five of them—there is Homes on the Hill, there is Columbus Housing Partnership, there is the Urban League, the Consumer Credit Counseling, accredited agencies that will help you.

□ 1715

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Reclaiming my time, we have seen tremendous resources springing up spontaneously across the country, reaching out to homeowners, reaching out to renters who find themselves in difficulty, who are seeking housing assistance. And just like in Columbus, we have the resources for 211 and other avenues, and the Ohio Department of Commerce has

done tremendous work in the State of Ohio. And we have talked about what got us here and the inaction of the multitude of Republican Congresses.

But I would like to draw attention just for a minute and recognize our colleague Congressman HIMES to discuss solutions because we have an opportunity this week. We have an opportunity this week to pass a predatory lending bill. And this will be, I hope, the predatory lending bill that becomes law in this country, that finally when we got here in 2009, we made our mark and we said enough. Enough of the politics as usual. Enough of the Bush administration's saying "no" to protecting consumers and protecting homeowners. We have strong predatory lending legislation that we hope will become law.

So I yield to my friend JIM HIMES.

Mr. HIMES. Thank you to my colleague from Ohio for organizing this on this very, very important topic.

At one level what we're discussing is really very simple. Like every one of my colleagues standing here today, I have deep respect and appreciation for the power of the free market. It is the free market that has created the wealthiest society in the history of humankind. However, a free market requires smart regulation. We regulate dangerous things. We regulate tobacco, we regulate alcohol, we regulate firearms because we understand that used responsibly, they can enhance one's quality of life, but used irresponsibly, they can be devastating. And if there is one lesson that we have learned from this economic crisis, it is that an excess of debt can be devastating, devastating to individuals, to families, and, as we have learned much to our peril, to our country as a whole.

We have a long record, as my colleague from Ohio has pointed out, of attempts, failed attempts, to put in place over Congress after Congress, Republican-controlled Congress after Republican-controlled Congress, attempts to regulate the more excessive and predatory aspects of consumer lending that never saw the light of day.

But now we have an opportunity, a really terrific opportunity to pass commonsense legislation, which in many ways mirrors the very commonsensical legislation that we saw passed in strong bipartisan fashion last week around credit cards with respect to predatory lending.

H.R. 728 is a bill that will bring about a reform of the most predatory of practices. And it's hard, as you dive into this bill, to disagree with what is in there. The bill establishes a simple Federal standard for all home loans that simply says that lending institutions must ensure that borrowers can repay the loans they are sold. Now, in a free market, the market would bring that discipline to bear. But there are oddities within the housing market, subsidies, other incentives that mean, and we are all suffering from this today, that all too often mortgages are

extended to families where the lender knows or perhaps doesn't know but didn't do the work but knows that the individual, the family cannot repay that mortgage. So how hard is it to conceive of a regulation that simply says that a lender must do the work to assure us and to assure the borrower and themselves as a lender that they can repay the loan?

Lenders would be required and mortgage brokers would be required, if a family qualifies for a prime mortgage, to not sell them a subprime mortgage. And this is a particularly pernicious aspect of the mortgage industry. We see it particularly in our minority communities where minority families who might qualify for the low rates associated with the prime mortgage instead are sold a subprime mortgage and therefore are paying hundreds, in some cases thousands, of dollars every month that they don't need to pay. Again, this bill would just assure that mortgage brokers and lenders are not financially incented to put people into mortgages that they don't need to be into. Good, commonsensical regulation.

This bill will also ask that our securitizers, and we know now that one of the aspects of the housing market that was a bit pernicious was that risk was just passed from one hand to another, sliced and diced, and the person who made the decision to take the risk by extending the mortgage a week later had no exposure to that risk. So we are asking that along the chain of custody of a mortgage, whether it's the broker, the lender, the securitizer, that people just do the very basic work to look at this stuff, to look at this stuff and to convince themselves that the law has been followed, that the policies are in place to make sure that you're not putting toxic paper into securities unknowingly, bringing some responsibility to a process which has been all too irresponsible for far, far too long.

This is commonsensical legislation, and I hope and expect that it will draw the same kind of bipartisan support that we saw for the Credit Cardholder's Bill of Rights last week.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. You know, Congressman, we used to say in Ohio that you had more protections in buying a toaster than you did a house in the State of Ohio before we passed predatory lending legislation. And the simple fact of the matter is that for far too long in the United States Congress, the Congress has bent over backward to protect the lenders, but they have failed to protect the consumers. And in failing to protect the consumers, it has not only cost those families who were duped into those predatory loans, but it has hurt neighborhoods, it has hurt communities, it has failed entire cities.

With that, I would like to yield to Congressman BOCCIERI from Ohio.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Representative DRIEHAUS.

Congressman HIMES brings up a very, very valid point. When Bob and Betty

Buckeye go to that local community bank, they sign for a 30-year mortgage, a 15-year mortgage, and they are expecting that their job is going to remain intact, that they're going to be able to make those mortgage payments. But what we found with the transactions across the market is that those mortgages were sold three, four, five times, and guess what. They wound up in some investment bank on Wall Street, and then we had hedge funds betting on people failing to pay their mortgage.

So this legislation and the action that the Congress is taking is making sure that Wall Street is put on notice to make sure that you're not going to bet on people failing, Americans failing. America is much better than that. We are more than that. We're not failures. We have a success story that is unmatched around this world.

And when you talk about 6,400 forecloses in my district alone, the largest county in my district ranking number one in a State that ranks number five in the country, 6 million people across this country have lost their homes, these aren't just real numbers. These are real people. These are real people.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. This is what Hamilton County, Ohio, looks like, Congressman. And thanks for the work of the folks that are working in neighborhoods for providing us this data. But this is what inaction in Congress means. It means foreclosures dotting the entire county. And I think I said earlier that in 33 of our neighborhoods in Cincinnati, we now have at least one in 10 homes standing vacant.

We have talked a bit about Ohio, but we have been joined by some of our colleagues from New Mexico and from Virginia. So I would like to recognize Representative LUJÁN from New Mexico for his comments and his observations as to the situation in New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. DRIEHAUS, thank you very much for yielding.

As we talk about the importance of looking after those that are most in need and those that have been getting impacted and thrown out of their homes, losing their homes on a regular basis, and you look to see the inactions that have caused this problem, and the actions that this Congress, the 111th Congress, is coming forward to work on to make sure that we're looking after those that need help the most, it's an honor to be here with so many of my new colleagues as we are talking about taking action and not just waiting and waiting and waiting, but being divisive and being bold in our approaches to make sure we're looking after the citizens that we represent.

Mr. DRIEHAUS, one important thing that I wanted to talk about today was there are so many people across the country who aren't able to afford that home, who are saving up and doing what they can so they can experience the American Dream of getting into that home. And they're renters. They are renting homes, and they are sup-

porting a whole other segment of the housing across the country. And it's a segment of the population that was ignored for many years.

Looking back at the Bush administration, when they took office in 2001, touting a homeownership agenda with the goal of 5.5 million new homebuyers, but they neglected to address affordable renting housing needs.

The legislation that we'll be looking at, one important aspect of it, is we're going to be protecting tenants who rent homes that go into foreclosure, recognizing that there is a whole other segment of the population that is very much in need, that are struggling, that made some good decisions, that were maybe lured by some of those predatory lenders but were able to hold off. And now we are going to be going forward, and these are some of the other people that the Democrats aren't turning their backs on, that we're looking to see how we can help.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Reclaiming my time, that provision is, in fact, an important part of the predatory lending bill that will be coming before us on this very floor on Thursday.

We do understand that not everybody can afford a home, not everybody should be purchasing a home, and there are many, many responsible families that are out there renting. And through no fault of their own, the landlord has gotten in trouble, and the building is now being foreclosed on, and because of that foreclosure, they're out on the streets. This bill provides them protection, necessary protection. The first time this Congress has acted to provide them protection.

So I appreciate your efforts on behalf of the renters and your standing up for the renters. And I just want to tell the people that we are standing up for them and that we will take action on Thursday on their behalf.

With that, I would like to turn it over to Mr. PERRIELLO from Virginia to offer his comments on this discussion.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Representative DRIEHAUS, this is indeed a very exciting moment. You can feel the sense of change.

Many of us that are part of this colloquy right now are all from the freshmen class, and I think it's not a coincidence because we represent a class that is in favor of accountability, accountability and common sense. Many of us were called to politics for the first time by watching more than a decade of irresponsibility here in Congress and in the White House where we saw policies of Wall Street greed cloaked in the sense of Main Street compassion in what was called the "ownership society," policies which seemed to suggest the idea that everyone could own a home regardless of how much money they made when really it was a strategy to help the rich make a lot of money on the failure of those who could never afford a house in the first place.

Year after year, as you've pointed out, there were opportunities to put

basic, commonsense accountability rules in place to prevent this from happening. And year after year we saw this Congress do nothing, do nothing, to challenge these absurd policies.

And we all know now that these policies affected much more than just the lender and the borrower. We all as Americans are in the same neighborhoods affected by these massive foreclosures. It doesn't just affect those who cannot afford their mortgage but those who live on streets where foreclosures have occurred. We have seen a fundamental lack of accountability. But you see this Congress, particularly with the new Members from the 2006 and 2008 class, pushing for real change on accountability. We saw it last week with the credit card bill. Fundamental commonsense legislation that said let's put some rules in place to prevent the tricks and the traps. If it's a product you can't sell on your own, you have to fool people into it, then maybe this is the place where basic consumer protections need to step in. Now we're ready to do the same thing with predatory mortgage lending because we are all affected by this. Our housing prices are all affected by it. Our retirement security is affected by it. And it's about time that we put in place the kind of commonsense legislation that will reward the good actors like our community banks that remained strong through this entire process instead of continuing to bail out those who have been the least responsible through this process.

This is a show that results are possible. They could have been possible if the will was there under previous Congresses and administrations. But now the will is there, and we will not rest until we put in these basic restrictions and continue to expand this new era of accountability to reverse the irresponsibility we have seen over the last 10 years and protect the American family and their right to homeownership.

Thank you.

□ 1730

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Congressman, thank you for your tremendous efforts on behalf of homeowners in Virginia.

As you say, we got elected. We got elected because people wanted to see change. Barack Obama was elected President of the United States because people wanted to see change, and they want to see Congress move forward.

But they keep hearing, on the other side of the aisle, the same old excuses. And the folks on the other side of the aisle don't want to point the finger at themselves. They forget; they have collective amnesia about their 12 years in power here in the House and their failure to do anything when it comes to predatory lending, when it comes to foreclosures.

I yield to Mr. HIMES for his observations and try to wrap this up.

Mr. HIMES. Thank you for the opportunity. I want to highlight one other practice that would be prohibited by

the antipredatory lending bill that is to come before the floor this week.

I spent many years as a vice president of the Enterprise Community Partners, a nonprofit affordable housing group and saw up close and personal the devastation that can be wreaked by a process, a product, if you will, known as asset stripping.

Asset stripping involves the extension of debt, either a mortgage or a home equity line, often to the elderly, often to minority populations, where the lender knows, the lender knows that there is no likelihood that either the senior citizen or the borrower, whoever that borrower may be, can repay that loan.

And it's very deliberate, because as a result of the loan, the lender knows they will come into possession of the home involved. They will take the equity in the home.

Now, in this world of declining real estate values, it's a little hard to understand that business model. But the reality is that ordinarily, when housing prices are rising steadily or less than steadily or more than steadily, as we saw in the last 10 years ago, that can be a very profitable business model based on the expectation that the borrower will fail. That is not the kind of product that anyone on either side of the aisle thinks should be out there victimizing, particularly the high concentration of the elderly and the minority borrowers who get caught up in this thing.

Asset stripping is a pernicious thing that would be forbidden by this antipredatory lending bill, and I think we should take great pride should that occur should this legislation pass.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Congressman, that's a good point and I have seen all kinds of anomalies in the market that have led to behaviors that you wouldn't want to see. If you were, in fact, elected to protect the public and the public good, you would want to crack down on these pernicious behaviors. And that's exactly what we are doing in the antipredatory lending bill.

But time and time again, if you turn on the radio, if you turn on C-SPAN, if you turn on CNN, you turn on Fox News, you hear Republican after Republican getting up and making excuses, not talking about the pernicious behaviors, not talking about what is wrong with the market and how we might correct that, but blaming all kinds of different actions that have been taken by this Congress in the past.

They go so far as to suggest the Community Reinvestment Act, the CRA, passed by this Congress in 1977, is the root cause of the housing crisis in the United States.

If I have heard this once, I have heard it a thousand times, and it is now talked about all the time on talk radio.

But when you look at the Community Reinvestment Act in 1977 and what it did, it addressed red-lining, be-

cause we knew that there were financial institutions that weren't lending in certain neighborhoods, especially minority and low-income neighborhoods. So we provided incentives for financial institutions to engage in responsible lending in those low-income and minority neighborhoods.

It was called the Community Reinvestment Act, and the Community Reinvestment Act was extremely successful. As a matter of fact, 83 percent of the failures, the loan failures that we are talking about, are not even with institutions that are covered by the CRA. That's a remarkable number.

Yet Republican after Republican blames the Community Reinvestment Act. So I would like to put this one myth to bed. I would like to do that by reading a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke, to Senator ROBERT MENENDEZ about the CRA. This letter is dated February 25, 2008.

"Dear Senator:

"Thank you for your letter of October 24, 2008, requesting the Board's view on claims that the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) is to blame for the subprime meltdown and current mortgage foreclosure situation. We are aware of such claims but have not seen any empirical evidence presented to support them. Our own experience with CRA over more than 30 years and recent analysis of available data, including data on subprime loan performance, runs counter to the charge that CRA was at the root of, or otherwise contributed in any substantive way to, the current mortgage difficulties.

"The CRA was enacted in 1977 in response to widespread concerns that discriminatory and often arbitrary limitations on mortgage credit availability were contributing to the deteriorating conditions of America's cities, particularly low-income neighborhoods. The law directs the four Federal banking agencies to use their supervisory authority to encourage insured depository institutions—commercial banks and thrift institutions that take deposits—to help meet the credit needs of their local communities, including low- and moderate-income areas. The CRA statute and regulation have always emphasized that these lending activities be 'consistent with safe and sound operation' of the banking institutions. The Federal Reserve's own research suggests that CRA-covered depository institutions have been able to lend profitably to lower-income households and communities and that the performance of these loans is comparable to other loan activity.

"Further, a recent Board staff analysis of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and other data sources does not find evidence that CRA caused high default levels in the subprime market. A staff memorandum discussing the results of this analysis is included as an enclosure."

He ends like this: "As the financial crisis has unfolded, many factors have

been suggested as contributing to the current mortgage market difficulties. Among these are declining home values, incentives for originators to place loan quantity over quality, and inadequate risk management of complex financial instruments. The available evidence to date, however, does not lend any support to the argument that CRA is to blame for causing the subprime loan crisis."

Mr. Speaker, I submit the November 25, 2008, letter to Senator MENENDEZ for the RECORD.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, DC, November 25, 2008.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of October 24, 2008, requesting the Board's view on claims that the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) is to blame for the subprime meltdown and current mortgage foreclosure situation. We are aware of such claims but have not seen any empirical evidence presented to support them. Our own experience with CRA over more than 30 years and recent analysis of available data, including data on subprime loan performance, runs counter to the charge that CRA was at the root of, or otherwise contributed in any substantive way to, the current mortgage difficulties.

The CRA was enacted in 1977 in response to widespread concerns that discriminatory and often arbitrary limitations on mortgage credit availability were contributing to the deteriorating condition of America's cities, particularly lower-income neighborhoods. The law directs the four federal banking agencies to use their supervisory authority to encourage insured depository institutions—commercial banks and thrift institutions that take deposits—to help meet the credit needs of their local communities including low- and moderate-income areas. The CRA statute and regulations have always emphasized that these lending activities be "consistent with safe and sound operation" of the banking institutions. The Federal Reserve's own research suggests that CRA covered depository institutions have been able to lend profitably to lower-income households and communities and that the performance of these loans is comparable to other loan activity.

Further, a recent Board staff analysis of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and other data sources does not find evidence that CRA caused high default levels in the subprime market. A staff memorandum discussing the results of this analysis is included as an enclosure.

Sincerely,

BEN BERNANKE.

Enclosure.

Yet the myth is perpetuated over and over again by my Republican colleagues.

We appreciate this opportunity, the newly elected Members of the Democratic class, to give an analysis of how we got here in terms of the mortgage crisis, how the mortgage crisis has led to the bank failures in this country, how we are now here to help pick up the pieces.

We were elected in November, along with the President, to work on solutions, to quit turning a blind eye to the economic crisis in this country.

But we know, over and over again, and I certainly saw it as a State legis-

lator, when we asked for Federal intervention in the markets, when we asked for Federal intervention when it came to foreclosures, there was only silence coming from Washington D.C.

On Thursday we have an opportunity. On Thursday we have an opportunity to pass antipredatory lending legislation that will make a difference, that will make a difference for every American family. And it is my hope that finally, in the spring of 2009, the Federal Government will step up to its responsibility and pass antipredatory lending legislation and pass a law that will be signed by this President to protect homeowners across the country.

WE MUST NOT IGNORE CONTINUING THREATS TO ISRAEL'S SURVIVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House voted to commemorate the 61st anniversary of Israel's independence. However, even as we recognize this historic occasion, we must not ignore the continuing threats to Israel's very survival, the greatest dangers presented by the radical regime in Tehran whose leader, Mr. Ahmadinejad, has repeatedly denied the Holocaust, as all of us know, and has called for Israel to be wiped off the map.

More recently, at last month's Durban II hate-fest in Geneva, Ahmadinejad reminded us of his regime's goals when he savagely attacked Israel, stating that "world Zionism personifies racism," and called Israel the "most racist" regime.

These are not mere idle words, Mr. Speaker. Ahmadinejad and his fellow thugs have long sought to make good on their call for Israel's elimination by sponsoring violent Islamic extremist groups and pursuing nuclear, chemical, biological and missile capabilities. In the face of such a menace to our strong, democratic ally, Israel, and to our vital interest in the Middle East, the U.S. and other responsible nations must not stand idly by. We cannot accept the prospect of an emboldened nuclear Iranian regime.

We must close loopholes in U.S. and international sanctions so as to deny the regime all remaining lifelines for their economy and compel it to abandon its destructive policies.

Further, we should realize that the existential threats to Israel, and the obstacles to peace, begin with Iran; but, sadly, they do not end there.

We must learn history's lesson that we will not achieve peace by engaging with these Islamic militant groups like the Iranian proxy, Hamas, or by recognizing a Palestinian Authority government that includes Hamas.

In standing with the Jewish state against those who seek to destroy it,

we should above all do no harm. Unfortunately, proposed funding for the Palestinian Authority, the West Bank and Gaza is included in the emergency supplemental, which would be before this floor in a matter of days; and it does not meet that standard of do no harm.

It would provide, in fact, hundreds of millions of dollars of assistance in Gaza, thereby essentially providing a bailout for Hamas, enabling Hamas to divert its funds from reconstruction and put it, instead, to the purchase of arms. It would reward and bankroll a Palestinian Authority that has proven itself unwilling or unable to fulfill its responsibilities.

When considering assistance to the Palestinian Authority, Mr. Speaker, we need to judge their leaders by their words, and by their acts as well. Just last week Palestinian Authority leader Abu Mazen reiterated his refusal to recognize Israel as a Jewish state. He said the same thing last year and the year before that, and there is no reason to think that more U.S. assistance will cause him to have a change of heart in the future.

Indeed, Abu Mazen and other senior Palestinian Authority officials have repeatedly emphasized that they do not expect Hamas or other violent Islamic groups to recognize Israel at all.

Instead, Abu Mazen bragged last year about his many years of leading and supporting violence against Israel, claiming that "I have the honor to be the one to fire the first bullet in 1965."

But this should come as no surprise, Mr. Speaker. In 2005, when campaigning for the leadership of the PA, he echoed Arafat and Hamas by referring to Israel as the Zionist enemy. A Palestinian transparency organization reported last month that many forms of favoritism, nepotism, misappropriation of public money and abuse of public position continued to impact many sectors of the Palestinian society.

□ 1745

If Palestinian leaders will not uphold their commitments to uproot violent extremism, to stop corruption, to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish democratic state, they should not receive 1 cent of U.S. taxpayer dollars. The proposed supplemental, however, would provide \$200 million in direct cash transfers to the P.A. Let's stop this bill, Mr. Speaker. It does not do justice to the U.S. nor to Israel.

DOMESTIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be down here, and I am going to turn immediately to my colleague, Dr. PAUL BROWN from Georgia, to talk on the cap-and-tax, global climate change, destruction of jobs in America,

a bill that may be coming to the floor soon.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank my dear friend JOHN SHIMKUS for leading this hour, and I congratulate him on his leadership on this extremely important issue on energy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are once again trying to pass off baloney for prime rib. In the last 100-plus days, we have seen nonstimulating stimulus packages, and we are probably going to see some more, secretive bills in an "open and transparent" Congress, and trillion dollar commitments to fiscal responsibility. Clearly, liberals have a monopoly on the misnomer. Unfortunately, the disguises are out again today with this tax-and-cap plan.

We must not be fooled by the rhetoric. This is a \$646 billion tax that will impact every American family, small business, and family farm. Family energy costs will rise by more than \$3,100 a year for every family. This is an outrageous tax on every family that drives a car, buys American products, or flips on their light switch when they come home. So unless your name is Fred Flintstone or you live in a cave, you will be impacted by this tax.

Senior citizens, the poor, and the unemployed will be hit the hardest by this tax as experts agree that they spend a greater portion of their income on energy consumption. This is a time when we should be promoting policies that stimulate our economy and not tear it down. Various studies suggest that anywhere from 1.8 million to 7 million jobs will be lost by this tax-and-cap policy. Make no mistake that the Democrats' airtight cap will suffocate America's small businesses, crippling America's respiratory system, the free economy.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will claim that this tax-and-cap will help clean up the environment; however, this doesn't seem that it is even about the environment or global warming anymore. This has turned into a revenue generator for NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID's radical agenda, their steamroller of socialism that is being shoved down the throats of the American people, and that agenda includes socialized medicine. The tax-and-trade will be one of the largest sources of revenue for their new radical socialistic agenda. Mr. Speaker, the cat is out of the bag, and the American people see through the disguises, rhetoric and misnomers. Taxing families during an economic recession is not the only way to clean up the environment.

Fortunately for the American people, Republicans have offered an alternative to this unaffordable new energy tax that no one can afford. We believe that you can clean up the environment and keep jobs at the same time.

Our solutions include American energy produced by American workers to create American jobs. Our all-of-the-above energy plan brings us closer to

energy independence, encourages greater efficiency and conservation, promotes the use of alternative fuels, and lowers gas prices.

And don't think Democrats aren't doing any back-scratching when it comes to their new energy tax. The Washington Times reported yesterday that a loophole has been tucked into this legislation written by the congressional liberals that would exempt at least one major energy company from at least one of the many onerous provisions of the Democrats' national energy tax plan, ultimately leaving hard-working families and small businesses to pick up the tab.

I encourage all the non-Fred and Wilma Flintstones in America out there to stand up and demand straightforward answers from your lawmakers about this new energy tax that is being promoted by NANCY PELOSI and company, and encourage your lawmakers instead to support an all-of-the-above energy plan that removes our dependence upon foreign oil, lowers energy costs, and will create more jobs.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have got to stop this tax-and-cap plan that is being promoted by the leadership of this House and Senate. It is going to kill the American economy, it is going to cost jobs, and I congratulate my dear friend from Illinois for bringing all this out and being a leader in promoting responsible energy policy for America that the American public can count upon. And I congratulate you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague, and I appreciate him coming down. I am going to turn quickly to my colleague from Tennessee, Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN, for such time as she may consume.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this issue and for hosting this Special Order hour. I am so pleased to come and join with you and discuss the issues that we have before us with the Democrats' national energy tax, or the cap-and-tax legislation as some call it, or cap our growth and trade our jobs, or, Mr. Speaker, many people refer to cap-and-trade as just that, because it is certainly what they are going to do.

Now, we also know that if they don't get their way on cap-and-trade, what they are talking about doing is an end run and coming back around and letting the EPA regulate CO₂ emissions under the Clean Air Act. Indeed, I have a bill, H.R. 391, that I would encourage all colleagues in this House, all Members of this House to sign on and support this bill and keep the EPA from going around against the will of the people and regulating CO₂ emissions under the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very interesting that as we are having this hour tonight and as we are looking at the logic of EPA and the logic of some of my colleagues, I wonder if we have considered that if you look at the EPA's threshold of 25,000 tons of CO₂, that

would make you a major emitter, if we have considered that the EPA threatens to use that regulation against every business, every farm, every church, or every building in this country. And, of course, before the EPA gets the chance to regulate CO₂, many of our colleagues want to come in and tax it right here so that they can both regulate the air that we breathe and tax the air that we both breathe and then that we exhale.

The debate that we have before us is not about making energy cleaner; it is not about making energy more plentiful. What we would see happen from this debate is that energy would become more and more scarce, and we also would see that the cost to every family would be more and more expensive.

So, here we are. We are talking about cap-and-trade; we are talking about the expense of it. And as expensive as energy costs got last year, we are not going to take any action that will make it more plentiful, we are not taking any action that would make it more readily available, we are not taking actions that are going to make it cleaner, and we are not taking actions that are going to make it more affordable. Indeed, the legislation before us would do quite the opposite.

So I join the gentleman from Illinois in being from a State, my State of Tennessee, that would be among the hardest hit by this new energy tax and by the efforts that are coming from the other side, indeed, their efforts to make energy more expensive. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have conveniently forgotten how quickly economic slowdowns follow escalating energy costs. They have forgotten how dramatically high gas prices impacted family budgets last summer. They look upon the increased use of mass transit in the wake of those energy costs as a positive development, forgetting that in many rural districts like mine in Tennessee there is no mass transit, there is no bus service that goes from Waynesboro to Adamsville to Selmer. There is no mass transit in these rural communities. And in picking winners and losers—which they do in this legislation; they pick lots of winners and decide who is going to be the losers—they are asking the American people in their bill to make a choice between very expensive energy or no energy at all. All their scheme will cap is American productivity and trade American jobs.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that if you were to ask each and every Member of this House, we would all say that we believe in clean air, clean water, and clean energy. We believe in conserving our environment for future generations.

Certainly, I grew up in a household with a mother who dedicated much of her life to conservation and beautification and preservation and historic preservation efforts, so much so that in 1997 Keep America Beautiful gave her

their lifetime achievement award. We grew up doing the things that helped clean this planet, looking for ways for energy to be more affordable and more accessible.

Now, Republicans as a whole believe in that type conservation for future generations. We do not believe that you need to tax the American people out of their house and home to pay for it, a house, by the way, which under a cap-and-trade system is going to be hotter during the summer and colder during the winter.

Republicans believe that we have more alternatives than wind and solar as sources for clean, secure energy. We know that we can safely exploit American oil resources to provide for a less expensive transition to alternative fuels. We know that we can power a next-generation electricity grid with safe nuclear power that will allow for practical electric cars and reliable transmission, rather than forcing the costs of energy to explode so that Washington might fund yet another expansion of the Federal Government.

Tennesseans know that hydroelectric power is safe and reliable. It is clean. It has powered our State for two generations. What bewilders me is that these kinds of innovative solutions are discouraged under the Democrat cap-and-tax system. It reinforces my belief that this bill is more about revenue than it is about revolutionary energy.

We should be doing things to encourage our innovators. We should be doing things that will incentivize exploration and transition to new types of energy, rather than making it more expensive, making it more scarce, and cutting off energy and innovation.

Republicans have proposals for safer, cleaner, cheaper domestic energy that will conserve our resources, secure our energy sources, and expand our economy. We do it without picking losers but, rather, by inspiring that innovative spirit that has solved problem after problem after problem in this Nation. We do it without making energy more expensive and more burdensome to the family budget. We do it without making power more scarce, but by making it more abundant.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this issue, and I encourage all of our colleagues to join us in making certain that we stand against cap-and-trade and also that we support H.R. 391, which will prohibit the EPA from regulating CO₂ emissions under the Clean Air Act.

□ 1800

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague for coming down and making the time. We have already had a colleague from Georgia and now from Tennessee. I'm now going to be followed by Dr. FLEMING of Louisiana, a new Member, and I think this shows the diversity of representation in this country.

I appreciate your coming down and you're free to open with your comments.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I also thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for her remarks. I certainly agree with everything she has said this evening. And perhaps I have a couple more things to add.

Mr. Speaker, there are no two ways about it: this is a revenue-boosting or a net tax system by any way you look at it. The experts have looked at it, economists and energy people. I guess you could call it cap-and-trade with a little C for the "cap" and a big T for "tax." What do I mean by that? Well, what is the cap-and-trade or what we call the "cap-and-tax?" Basically, it says that there are factories out there that can burn coal or emit CO₂ into the atmosphere as long as they can find somebody else by way of allotments who are perhaps under the threshold by taking that burden from them. And in the process, there is some sort of exchange of currency.

Now what kind of currency are we talking about? Well, it is estimated, at least at this point, and we don't have details as often we don't get on these things, of \$646 billion of net taxation to our economy. So again, let there be no mistake about it. This is a tax.

Now, what effect will it have on us Americans? Well, first of all, we know it is going to increase unemployment because as the tax burden is put on the factories and as it is put on power plants, there will have to be a movement of factories and other things offshore or to other countries who are not part of this program. We also know that it hits the poor. And it is also going to lower the overall standard of living.

Well, here is just a couple of facts that I would like to share with you, Mr. Speaker. A recent MIT study shows that cap-and-tax will cost the average American household \$3,100 a year. Now, I know there has been some controversy about this. And it is my understanding that the MIT people went back and said, we were wrong on that; it is more than \$3,100.

Another study shows that we are likely to lose three to four million American jobs if this is enacted. Companies who are looking to invest in our economy will simply move overseas, as I said. There is also a debate about whether it will create a stimulus. For the last few months, we have been talking about how important stimulus is to our economy. Well, this will definitely stimulate an economy. It will stimulate other countries' economies while hurting our economy.

Now all of this perhaps would be a theoretical and perhaps a hypothetical discussion except for the fact that cap-and-trade is not really a new concept. They have had it in Europe for years. This morning I heard Dr. Gabriel Calzada talk about this. This gentleman is from Spain and an expert in this area. So what is the Spanish experience in this, Mr. Speaker? What Spain found was that for every green

job that was added, and again, I'm not exactly sure what a "green job" is, but for every green job, there was a loss of 2.2 jobs. In the so-called "green jobs" it was found that 90 percent of these jobs were in the implementation or construction. And these jobs were quickly dissipated as soon as the construction was ended. So what is the current unemployment rate of Spain? Seventeen and a half percent.

Now there was also a discussion by a very interesting expert in microeconomics. Aparna Mathur is her name. And I would like to read some very interesting facts into the RECORD: "These higher costs of production by cap-and-trade will translate to higher energy and product prices. In a paper that I co-authored with my colleagues at the American Enterprise Institute, we estimate that a cap-and-trade system, with a \$15 permit price, will increase the cost of everything, from food, clothing, shoes and home furnishings by 1 percent, of gasoline 7.7 percent, electricity 12.5 percent, and natural gas 12.3 percent. Of course, as previous experience with cap-and-trade programs has shown, permit prices are likely to be extremely volatile and rising over time, and our \$15 price estimate is likely to be conservative. Other studies suggest that the price could be above \$50 in 2015, close to \$100 in 2030 and \$200 in 2050. We can safely project that our estimates will be some multiple of these higher prices."

Now, also she points out something else, and that is this: as a percent of the total home budget for poor people, electricity is 4 percent, whereas for richer, more wealthy people, upper middle class perhaps, it is only 1 percent. Therefore, the burden to a low-income person is going to be four times that of someone of higher income. So what does this do in net effect? What it does is it hits the poor first and worst. How else does it hit the poor and how else does it hit everyone else? Well, we know that all the costs have to be passed along to the consumer. So as Dr. Mathur pointed out, we are going to see inflation in the cost of everything we do because everything we have today in terms of products, and even services to some extent, are dependent upon energy cost. And certainly it is going to create unemployment, because if this system were implemented worldwide, perhaps it would be an even playing field. But that is not the case. We know that for everything we do, we have China and India that is reversing that tremendously in terms of the impact on the environment. And while their economies are growing rapidly, ours will be diminishing related to this.

So the net effect of that, Mr. Speaker, is that if we move forward with this crazy plan, we are going to see both middle class and lower-income people hurt the worst. We are going to see an overall lowering of life styles. We are going to see ourselves less productive and less competitive around the world.

And that is going to relegate to actually a net loss in jobs.

So I call upon my colleagues in our discussion this evening—and hopefully this bill won't even come to the floor. But if it does, I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to vote “no” on this wasteful bill that is really, in my opinion, just another Trojan horse, a way of generating revenue to pay for new social programs and perhaps even newer social programs that are yet to be determined.

And with that, I thank you, Mr. SHIMKUS, and I yield back to you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Thank you, Dr. FLEMING, for joining us. Now I'm pleased to be joined by the ranking member of our Agriculture Committee from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Ranking Member GOODLATTE, thanks for joining us.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for holding this Special Order to talk about the cap-and-tax proposal that has been offered by Chairman WAXMAN of the Energy and Commerce Committee and subcommittee Chairman MARKEY of the subcommittee dealing with energy on that committee. And it concerns me greatly as it should concern all Americans.

When you look at the sources of energy that we have in our country today, this legislation is going to drive up energy costs for the average American. It is going to drive up the costs of a whole lot of other things than simply their electric bills and the cost of other energy they receive. It is also going to drive up the cost of virtually every good that they receive and a lot of services that they receive as well. It concerns me greatly.

I have served as the ranking member and previously the chairman of the Agriculture Committee. Today I serve as the ranking member on the subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee that deals with energy. And quite frankly, it is a situation where this is a solution in search of a problem. And quite frankly, the solution is going to create great problems for the American people.

What we really need to have in this country in this time of very severe economic turmoil when people are losing their jobs and the economy is suffering is we need to be looking at producing more domestic sources of energy of all kinds. And yet this legislation is going to discourage the production of most of the principal sources of energy that we utilize in our country today, including coal production and nuclear power.

The gentleman may correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding is that nuclear power, which is completely CO₂ gas emission-free, is going to not receive any credit for the availability of electricity that is produced from this source which today produces about 20 percent of all of our electricity in the country. And it seems to me that if you're truly dedicated to solving our problems of energy sources, you would

want to be encouraging increased production of all different sorts of energy.

Now nuclear power is very capital intensive. But once you have a new nuclear power plant, it is the cheapest source of electric generation that exists in the country, even far cheaper than coal as a source of energy. And yet the fact that it is CO₂-free doesn't seem to make any difference, because there are those in the environmental community who are very hostile to nuclear power production, even though we have—and countries like France which now produces more than 75 percent of its electricity from nuclear power—have addressed in new and innovative ways the waste disposal issue and other safety issues that make nuclear power very, very attractive.

And then when it comes to coal, do you know that more than half of our electricity in this country is generated by coal? It is a very, very important source of energy. And yet it is treated like the lost step-child in this legislation because no effort is really made here to help coal address the serious concerns that have been raised by some about the amount of CO₂ that is emitted from coal production. That to me does not make any sense. We are the Saudi Arabia of the world in terms of coal production. We have more coal reserves than any other country in the world. And we have tremendous capabilities in terms of long-term ability to generate cheap, low-cost power.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Would the gentleman yield on coal just for a second? I think this is an important issue, of course, for me. But a couple of recent occurrences highlight the fact that this bill really is an assault on coal. And however they try to clean it up, it is not working. Yesterday in the local paper, what did Speaker PELOSI do? She said the coal-fire power plant here in the Capitol is now switching to natural gas, that coal is gone. At a news conference briefing held last week at the United States Energy Association, FERC Chairman Wellinghoff told reporters that nuclear and coal power was too expensive. He estimated the cost of building a nuclear plant at about \$7,000 per kilowatt and discouraged investors from undertaking such ventures.

So the signals are no nuclear and no coal.

Mr. GOODLATTE. So what are they going to replace it with?

Mr. SHIMKUS. They don't like coal. They don't like hydro. But don't like nuclear. But they like electricity.

Mr. GOODLATTE. They like electricity? I like electricity. You like electricity. But you have to produce it with something.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Here is the President's comments.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Seventy-five percent of our electricity—people who are paying attention to this issue should know that 75 percent of the electricity produced in our country today is produced from coal and nuclear.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And here is the President's statement during the campaign: “What I have said is that we would put a cap-and-trade system in place that is as aggressive, if not more aggressive, than anybody else's out there. So if somebody wants to build a coal-fired power plant, they can. It is just that it will bankrupt them because they are going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that is being emitted.”

So the signals are “no” in a venue when the demand for electricity is going to go up by 30 percent. But we want to limit the ability to produce electricity which is why we fear the real price escalations.

I just want to tie this in with the leadership of this House in Washington and down at the White House and through the Federal agencies. They are saying “no” to coal and “no” to nuclear when we have all these challenges that face us.

□ 1815

Mr. GOODLATTE. And they have no good answer in terms of what to replace it with. Wind power and solar, two that are very commonly cited, produce just a tiny percentage of the electricity in our country today. I think wind power and solar are great and they have great potential and we should encourage more of them, but there is no way that they are going to replace our traditional sources of generating electricity any time in the near future.

So the natural result is going to be that if you write legislation that heavily penalizes other sources of energy, particularly coal, what you are going to have as a result is much higher energy costs. And it will affect people all across the country in very dramatic ways, and they will see it when they open their bill for their electricity. But they are also going to see it in ways that may surprise them in terms of the cost of goods and services and in terms of their very livelihood because many jobs will go outside of the country to other countries like Russia and China and India that have no intention of complying with the same type of a cap-and-tax system that is being proposed right here in this Congress. Therefore, they are going to have cheaper sources of energy.

China and India, right now, are building one new coal-fired power plant a week. Are they going to comply with cap-and-tax? Are they going to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions? No, they are going to dramatically increase those greenhouse gas emissions, and the end result is they will produce electricity cheaper. Therefore, they will be able to produce goods cheaper in those countries. They will be a magnet to draw jobs to those countries, to become manufacturing bases, as they are already growing to be. It is just going to get worse.

Even though China has grown so much in terms of its manufacturing in

recent years, the United States is still the world's largest manufacturing country. We are going to lose that when this bill takes effect if we don't get the American people to speak out about it and let the Members of Congress know that this kind of damaging legislation will cost jobs and raise the cost of living in this country if it is not brought to a halt.

Every source of energy that we have, whether it is coal or nuclear power or oil or natural gas or solar or wind power or geothermal or renewable biofuels, all of them have environmental issues attached to them. You can't name a one that doesn't.

Wind power has all kinds of environmental issues attached to it. People have attempted to build wind power facilities in my district and have gotten great push back on the effect about birds and bats and noise.

Solar generating facilities that have been proposed for the southwest of this country have had lawsuits brought against them to prevent them from building these solar facilities because of the impact it will have on desert vegetation and desert wildlife and so on.

Ethanol and other renewable fuels have environmental opponents to them as well.

So it seems to me that the all-of-the-above approach of the Republican Conference, of promoting the development of new sources of energy, of promoting energy conservation and efficiency, and of promoting the development of all of our sources of energy, including our traditional sources, and producing them domestically to reduce our foreign trade deficit problems and to create more jobs in this country is the way to go here. That ought to be the alternative that this Congress turns to instead of a cap-and-tax government planning scheme that stifles private sector innovation, that causes higher consumer energy prices and causes job losses and lower wages and stock devaluation.

Its potential for abuse and corruption is great. It is a windfall for certain people who didn't do anything to deserve the benefits that they will get when they suddenly find that they have something to sell or trade under this system. And it is not likely to actually reduce any emissions significantly.

This idea that somehow we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the extent that we can turn down the thermostat of the world when other countries are going to increase their CO₂ emissions around the world is folly. That is what this legislation is, and it has no guarantee that it will solve the global warming issue that many have focused on. Instead, we do have a guarantee that it will have a devastating impact on our economy.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak during this Special Order.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate the gentleman coming down, and I would like to now recognize the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman and I am delighted to be here with Mr. SHIMKUS.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. SHIMKUS has done so much on energy for so long in the Energy and Commerce Committee and has really brought to the forefront so many innovations and ideas on how we can solve our problems, and also making sure that we do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about our national energy and environmental future. I am really worried that Congress may soon consider the cap-and-trade legislation in an attempt to move America toward a clean energy economy and decrease our reliance on foreign oil sources.

That sounds good, doesn't it, and the act in its current form will do that, but it will do much worse, and I cannot support a cap-and-trade program that will unfairly penalize small business, industry and taxpayers across the country.

A lot of my constituents get this. I would like to read a short quote from one of my constituents. The gentleman is from Darien, Illinois, and he says: "I am writing to ask you to vote 'no' on any cap-and-trade bill that comes up for a vote this congressional session. Cap-and-trade is a huge tax on every American who flips on a light switch or puts gas in their car. Cap-and-trade would do nothing to affect global climate change, but would harm our economy and lead to job losses and higher taxes for all Americans."

Many estimates exist on job losses and rising electricity prices under a cap-and-trade program. One recent and very conservative estimate suggests that Illinois would lose 48,000 manufacturing jobs by 2020 and see a \$1.47 per kilowatt increase in their utility bills. Illinois is 50 percent reliant on nuclear power followed by coal.

For this reason, I think with record unemployment and foreclosures, how can we ask the American people to swallow a huge cost of living increase when they are already struggling to live?

In an apparent trend, the recently passed budget resolution slashed Yucca Mountain funding. This disturbs me. It effectively signaled lack of support for expanded nuclear production, closing the window of opportunity for a waste solution. Taxpayers have already put \$16 billion into this mountain to take care of our waste. So this is welcome back to the Carter years when the reprocessing plants that were built here in the United States, six of them, were shut down before they even opened. I think one opened.

Mr. Speaker, there is no silver bullet solution for the future of our national energy supply, but we would be irresponsible to incentivize emission reductions without including supply increase solutions. I think that the U.S. can lead in the environmental performance and production with this policy. I just don't believe that cap-and-trade is an appropriate means of doing that.

We need a combination of technology and increased production of nuclear renewables and fossil fuels. Each have to be a part of the long-term plan for America's energy and environmental security.

I want to focus for a moment on the nuclear. As I said, Illinois is 50 percent nuclear, 20 percent in our country, and there are a lot of permits pending out there for increased nuclear plants. But we need reprocessing to deal with the waste. If you thought of nuclear energy as a log, and you cut 3 percent off this side and 3 percent off of that side of the log, and you put that log, the 3 percent plus the 3 percent and burned it, and then take the other part of the log, which is 94 percent, and put that into the ground as waste, that is what we are doing right now. So we can really increase the capabilities of nuclear and we can reduce the toxicity and we can reduce the longevity of the radioactivity. So this is a no-brainer. I can't understand the Secretary of Energy and the administration suddenly deciding that we put a hold on the recycling process when we have worked so hard and come so far on the research to be ready to do that without nuclear proliferation.

So I think we really have to look at doubling the amount of power generated from zero emission nuclear power by 2030; and, more importantly, we need to begin nuclear fuel recycling and incentivize interim storage to get us there. Recycling reduces the volume of that, and it is clean and it is safe. And then utilizing technology to transition to a low carbon transportation system is another way we can dramatically decrease petroleum use and reduce emissions.

Lithium batteries in fuel-cell technology, like those being developed in Illinois at Argonne National Lab in my district, will transform both the auto manufacturing sector and help America recapture the domestic battery manufacturing base.

I currently serve as the co-Chair of the High Performance Building Caucus, and each month we hear from a business or an association about the technology, a service that offers a solution for improving commercial and residential building efficiency. Forty percent of the emissions in this country come from existing building infrastructure. So retrofitting existing buildings or utilizing technology in new building construction can serve a variety of things. There are so many things that we can do. We need everything to cut out the CO₂ and the other gas emissions that cause so many problems.

Illinois is almost exclusively dependent on nuclear power followed by coal, so we cannot afford the price spikes that would follow a cap-and-trade plan, especially without the increased power production.

I hope that leadership on both sides of the aisle remember to put their constituents first when it comes to considering climate legislation and allow

technology and the market to pave the way for emission reductions.

I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order. I think it is a great benefit that we continue to discuss this issue. I hope that we can all work together to really solve this. Cap-and-trade will not do it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague.

It is very important that we continue this discussion, this dialogue, and help inform the American public.

The reality is the 686-page bill, so it is \$1 billion a page, but the reality is that there are large portions that are to be written later. Part of our challenge to really debate this bill is to call my friends out and say, okay, you promised transparency. You promised openness and regular order. What are the scores so we can figure out the winners and losers? But it is crafted behind closed doors.

In fact, I heard today that this bill will now bypass the subcommittee and hopefully go to the full committee, which is really a shame for individuals who have promised regular order to continue to disregard it.

In fact, Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman MARKEY, and Chairman Emeritus DINGELL all sent a letter making sure that this would not be done in reconciliation, and pushing for regular order. They sent a letter to President Obama.

And it is now these very same people who sent a letter begging for regular order who are not going to allow regular order to occur on this bill. That is sad because it hurts our ability to educate our constituents, our voters, and let them make a decision. And they do that every 2 years.

With that, I am pleased to be joined by a new Member from Pennsylvania, Mr. GLENN THOMPSON.

□ 1830

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you, sir. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue because this is, as I was preparing to come to Congress, the fact that we had a complete lack of a national energy plan and that our energy situation we were in was just not facing us from our energy needs, but our economy and our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an energy-intensive part of the country in rural Pennsylvania. I can say that the cap-and-tax plan is nothing more than a national energy tax. The devastating impacts of creating such a program are obvious and alarming—while the benefits remain entirely unclear.

A cap-and-trade program will not just raise the price of gas at the pumps and increase our home heating and cooling bills, but it will increase the cost of all goods and services that we rely on.

The truth behind the cap-and-tax plan is that it will lead to more taxes, fewer jobs, and more government intrusion in our lives.

The President's energy plan is a \$646 billion tax that will hit almost every

American family, small business, and family farm. Family energy costs will rise on average by more than \$3,100 a year. That makes no sense, considering the current economic crisis we find ourselves in.

Those hardest hit by this massive tax will be the poor, who, experts agree, spend a greater portion of their income on energy consumption. Cap-and-trade—cap-and-tax—amounts to, literally, a war on the poor.

In my district, many folks depend on the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program to make energy costs more affordable just to make ends meet. It makes zero sense to impose what are essentially new taxes on energy when we have programs like this to make it cheaper for those who need it most.

Now, we believe that there are better solutions—better solutions than more taxes and few jobs and more government intrusion. And while I strongly favor diversifying our energy portfolio and increasing our renewable sources, we have to be realistic about how we go about this.

We talk a lot about renewable energy sources, but the fact remains that wind and solar still make up less than 1 percent of our total energy consumption in needs that it meets. Even with heavy government investment and involvement, it's obvious that these sources will continue to be minor contributors in the coming decades to our energy needs. A cap-and-trade system equates to enormous new taxes on fossil fuels, which currently accounts for 85 percent of our overall energy consumption.

What do we know about the experience with cap-and-tax? Well, Spain is a country that has been identified as a success story for cap-and-trade by President Obama. Now I agree that the best predictor of future performance is past performance. That has been something I have led my life by as I have made my decisions. So what has been Spain's experience over the past 7 years with cap-and-trade?

Earlier today, at the Republican Energy Solutions hearing, we heard testimony from Dr. Gabriel Calzada Alvarez from a university in Madrid, Spain. Dr. Alvarez reported on the failure of cap-and-trade in Spain. What are the outcomes that he saw of cap-and-trade—the real past performance of cap-and-trade?

First, unemployment. There were 2.2 jobs lost for every 1 job created in Spain. For every 10 green jobs that were created, only 1 survived. The rest require continuous massive government subsidy and funding.

The second outcome we saw was unaffordable energy costs. The price of energy in Spain has gone up 31 percent during those 7 years of this grand experiment with cap-and-trade.

The third outcome has been unreliable energy. Spain's power grid system has been unreliable, with blackouts that he reported, leading some pro-

ducers to move their manufacturing plants to other countries.

Dr. Alvarez reported that just last week, British Petroleum closed two solar plants in Spain, and said that the wind and solar industries are losing thousands of jobs.

Interestingly enough, a number of these manufacturers in Spain moved to our country to escape Spain's cap-and-tax. I'm absolutely confident today they may be packing their bags, getting ready to move again, along with our own United States manufacturers, because of the crushing impact and the discussions we are having of imposing this proposed cap-and-tax in our country today.

Mr. Speaker, the best predictor of future performance is past performance. The only measurable outcomes of this proposed national energy tax is, based upon past performance, higher unemployment, higher energy costs, and unreliable energy sources. Frankly, Americans deserve better.

I really appreciate the gentleman yielding time, and I appreciate your leadership on this very important and critical issue.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for joining us. I look forward to working with him as we move to defeat this, wherever we get a chance to.

Now, just for my colleagues to know, I think there are about 10 minutes remaining. I would like to now give the time to Dr. PHIL GINGREY, a colleague of mine from Georgia on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Representative SHIMKUS for leading not just this hour, Mr. Speaker, not just this hour tonight, but he has been in a leadership role on an all-of-the-above approach to solving our energy problem and our dependence on a lot of countries that don't like us very much for our sources of oil and natural gas.

This goes back, Mr. Speaker, to the August recess of last year, where so many of us on this side of the aisle just spent literally the entire month with the lights down low and the microphones off and the C-SPAN cameras not running, but just bringing people on the floor of this House that were visiting the people's House on summer vacation and talking to them about an all-of-the-above approach to solving our energy problems.

So I thank Representative SHIMKUS for that, and my colleague from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and Representative G.T. THOMPSON. I think about the person he replaced in Pennsylvania, a long-serving member in this body, who retired—John Peterson—and the work that he did in regard to clean coal and his efforts. Of course, that is a signature issue that Representative SHIMKUS is trying to rally us behind—clean coal technology, carbon sequestration, and things that are part of this total package of all-of-the-above.

Just real quickly let me say this. I heard Representative BIGGERT talk

about the situation in Illinois. I wasn't really aware of the dependence on nuclear for electricity in Illinois and its relationship to how much energy is generated by coal. So you have got that one-two punch in Illinois.

It's just the opposite in Georgia. It's mostly coal. Some hydro and a little bit of nuclear. We are very likely to get the next two nuclear power generators come online pretty soon at Plant Vogtle in my great State of Georgia.

But there is no question that this cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax—you know, the word scheme can be a pejorative. And I honestly believe, as I stand here and tell my colleagues, that I think this is a scheme. It is a scheme to get jobs that have long ago located in the South and Southeast because of the low cost of labor, to get them back into Massachusetts or out in California. And this is the way they do it. They are not willing to cut the cost of labor, for obvious reasons, so they jack up the price of energy in the Southeast and in Illinois and other States of the breadbasket of the country and the Rust Belt.

I think if you go around your district and you talk to people, every manufacturer will tell you, "For goodness sake, Congressman, do something about stopping this cap-and-tax situation."

That's what we are all about here tonight. I know time is limited so I want to yield back and let some of my other colleagues have a little time. But, JOHN SHIMKUS, thank you for the opportunity. We will continue to be with you on this effort. We have got to stop this scheme.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate my colleague from Georgia. Georgia has some significant challenges on the renewable electricity standard that they are trying to cram down, which will definitely increase rates in the Southeast. We need you in the fight—and we are glad you are here.

I would now like to turn to my other colleague and friend, also from the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman STEVE SCALISE from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from Illinois on his leadership on this issue as well. As my other colleague said, this is one of those big battles that happens up here in Congress not too often, but at a time when we are facing very difficult times in our economy.

We are talking about different things that we can do to get our economy back on track. But for the last few years, a lot of us have been talking about what we need to do to really achieve energy independence, to reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, stop sending billions of dollars to countries that don't like us, but also to really promote those alternatives in our own country so that we can get to that next level of generation of new energy sources.

So this bill, this cap-and-trade energy tax, comes before us. If you look

at President Obama's own budget, President Obama's budget estimates that a cap-and-trade energy tax would generate \$646 billion in new taxes on American families—something that would have a devastating impact.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates 3 million to 4 million jobs would be lost. The President's own budget director says average American families would pay thousands of dollars more on their home utility bills. So I think as people look at this, they realize this is the wrong approach.

The good news is there is a better way to do this. We filed last year the American Energy Act, a bill to actually promote a comprehensive energy plan to get energy independence in America, but to get it by using our own natural resources; to explore our oil, our natural gas, which we keep finding more reserves throughout the country. Up in Shreveport, Louisiana, we found the largest natural gas reserve in the country's history.

So we have got those natural resources in our own country. Unfortunately, a lot of policies here stop us from using them. That could create hundreds of thousands of jobs, generate billions of dollars for our economy, and then you would use that money to promote and find and explore those alternative sources of energy like wind, like solar, to get those online; to encourage more conservation, as people are already doing.

But we also need to include clean coal technology and nuclear power. Nuclear is a source that emits no carbon. And so as we have heard from some of these studies, the Spain study is a really good indicator, a country that has gone down this cap-and-trade energy tax road and has realized how devastating it is to their economy.

That study that just came out in Spain that said for every green job they created, every permanent green job, they lost over 20 full-time jobs, because even the bulk of the jobs they created were temporary jobs. So for every job they created that was a permanent job, they lost 20 jobs in their economy. And they have realized it was a failure.

America surely shouldn't go down that road. That's why we are proposing these alternatives. There is a much better way—a way that we can achieve American energy independence by promoting the alternatives and using our natural resources that we have in this country to create good jobs, keep those jobs here, promote the alternative sources of energy, and reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate my colleagues—all my colleagues—for coming down here tonight. In fact, I didn't have to spend much time, we had so many people involved. I think it shows the concern of this debate.

One of our new Members recently elected—and when you are elected out

of cycle, you get a chance to get sworn in and speak here. And he actually had one of the best speeches I have ever heard. In fact, I wrote it down to a point that I wanted to highlight his comments.

He said, "It is a humbling experience to take a job when people back home are losing theirs, and become a member of this House when people are losing theirs."

It made me appreciate the great honor that the people of southern Illinois have bestowed on me to come here and represent them. How dare I come here and cast votes that would cause them to lose their jobs in even greater numbers. I am here to protect their jobs.

Why am I so impassioned? In the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, this mine, Peabody No. 10 in Kincaid, Illinois, closed. Twelve hundred jobs were lost in just one mine. Fourteen thousand in southern Illinois.

The Special Order before this had a lot of members from Ohio, and one of them mentioned Bob and Betty Buckeye, which I thought was cute. Ohio lost 35,000 coal mine jobs. Ohio. About 92 percent of their energy portfolio is coal.

If you follow President Obama's quotes and you follow the FERC chairman and you follow the bill, this is an assault on every State that relies on coal-fired power and the miners that get that coal from the ground.

We will have a chance to talk, debate, offer amendments to make sure that these jobs are protected, and then when my colleague makes a comment, "it is humbling to be given a job when people are losing theirs," we best be about the business of protecting the jobs of our constituents.

□ 1845

And this cap-and-tax, this national energy tax, will destroy jobs; and that is what we are here to fight.

I see my colleague is here. I have 1 minute left, and I recognize the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate all the work the gentleman has done, and I know we will be doing this in the future.

Obviously, this cap-and-tax Special Order that you are talking about tonight points out the fact that we are looking at higher energy costs, what you were just talking about here, fewer jobs, and of course more government interference and intrusions into private lives. When we come to the floor next time to address this issue, I want to address the issue of "not in my back yard," or NIMBY, and the fact that you are running at cross purposes here. And that is that, in order to do some of the good things that they want to do—which is to get to some alternatives, renewables, and the like—we cannot do it in the structure that is in the bill before us, or what have you, because new electricity demands will be graded, spikes in energy costs will occur, the

fact that we need new transmission lines—and I will be able to come to the floor to explain in detail how this is not already occurring because of the problems with NIMBY, the fact that people do not want to have this occur in their back yard.

I commend the gentleman on his work here. And I look forward to elaborating on this in future floor remarks.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate my colleague joining me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to sit here on the floor and listen to my colleagues deal with their talking points about climate change, carbon pollution, and what they would like to debate. Sadly, they are a little bit out of phase with what, in fact, we are facing as a Nation. Luckily, the American people understand that there is a serious problem facing us dealing with carbon pollution, and they favor action to do something about it.

The American people know that ice disappearing in our polar regions, birds migrating further and further north because of the change in the temperatures, the weather that is being disruptive with drought and extreme weather events and the consensus of the scientific community all converge. We've got a problem, and it is threatening life as we know it.

The American public is not likely to be somebody who is told by 98 doctors that their child is seriously ill and needs a specific medicine or treatment. The American public would not be inclined to go search for a single doctor that disagrees, to take a chance. If you have engineering experts who tell you that you are living in a building that is likely to collapse, you think about that seriously. And if you get a second opinion and a third opinion and a fourth opinion and a fifth opinion and they all agree that the building is likely to fall down upon you and your family or your customers, you are not likely to keep searching for that one outlier who says don't worry about it.

The public knows that we have a serious problem. There is a consensus in the scientific community that we need to do something about it. And, indeed, everything that we are talking about doing to control carbon pollution and to reduce our dependence, particularly on petroleum, but especially foreign oil, all of these are things that we should be doing anyway, even if we weren't threatened by global warming and serious disruption from the carbon pollution.

Sadly, the last hour demonstrated again that too many on the other side

of the aisle have simply lost their ability to have a serious conversation about what the scientific community and the majority of the American public feel is a serious problem; indeed, maybe the greatest single threat to our way of life.

I am reminded of what happened 68 years ago in this Chamber. The world was being slowly engulfed in World War II. The Nazis had taken over most of Europe and Great Britain was at risk. The Japanese had moved throughout the South Pacific. The United States was looking at an international landscape that was increasingly more and more threatening. But 68 years ago, there were some in this Chamber—actually, a majority on the other side of the aisle—that weren't that concerned. They felt that we were still shaking off the events of a Great Depression and we couldn't afford money on a military buildup, that we shouldn't have the human resources in our military.

We were facing the expiration of the conscription, the military draft. There was a vote 68 years ago that by only one vote, 203–202, enabled us to have a military draft and have some semblance of the tools available when the inevitable happened. And on December 7, 1941, the day that President Roosevelt said before us in this Chamber would live in infamy, at least we had those tools available to be able to spring into action and fight to save our country from existential threats.

I feel very strongly that we are facing something similar today, and we are going to have too many people in this Chamber who are not going to be able to answer a question that will be posed by history 68 years from now. They are not going to be able to look their children and grandchildren in the eye 10 or 15 years from now and explain why they weren't part of a process to provide a solution to the threat of global warming.

Listen to the echoes that are still in this Chamber from our colleagues. One gentleman I like was talking about how there was a recent MIT study that showed that there was \$3,100 in cost from a program of preventing carbon pollution, a cap-and-trade program. And then he acknowledged, well, there are some controversies surrounding it. Absolutely there is controversy surrounding it. But then he went on to say, well, it appears as though the number is even higher than \$3,100. Absolutely false.

The author of that report, in fact, has written to the Republican leadership that has been misusing the study to say that it is wrong in so many ways he doesn't know how to count. It would be a tiny fraction of that amount, and that assumes that we are not giving things back directly from those resources to make a difference for people. It is embarrassing that people are still purposely misstating research like that, but it is typical.

Echoing in the Chamber now, there was somebody who was talking about

how important it is to support Republican legislation to prevent the EPA from doing its job under the Clean Air Act to deal with carbon pollution. I find that embarrassing. For the last 8 years, the Bush administration has abdicated its responsibility under the Clean Air Act to take action. Indeed, even this Supreme Court slapped them down for dragging their feet dealing with the auto tailpipe standards. What an outrageous response. Instead of joining in an effort to work to make sure that we are meeting the challenge, instead we are going to introduce legislation to prevent the EPA from doing its job if Congress fails to act.

We heard my friend from Illinois talk about how deeply concerned he was that, under the Speaker's leadership, we have changed the Capitol Hill Power Plant that for the 14 years that I have been in Congress has been belching cold smoke into the air—one of the most serious sources of air pollution here in Washington, D.C.—somehow the fact that the Speaker has acted with legislative leadership in the Senate to solve this problem by cutting the emissions in half and using natural gas instead of coal, that somehow that is bad. Well, as somebody who lives in Washington, D.C. over a third of the time, I am glad that we are not going to be polluting the air with carbon pollution. I think it is the least we should be doing for the millions of people who live in the metropolitan area, in terms of clean air, dealing with the awful substances that are part of the emissions from coal. And to think somehow that that is wrong gives you a sense of the mindset.

The new Representative from Pennsylvania was troubled by "a complete lack of an energy plan." Well, maybe he is so new to Congress that he hasn't noticed that George Bush and the Republicans have been running things here for the last 8 years and, in fact, have passed various pieces of legislation to the benefit of some of the polluting energy industries, but failed to come forward with a comprehensive energy proposal.

The notion somehow that we can't move forward in a thoughtful, comprehensive fashion to be able to design a system to reduce carbon pollution, I think, is, frankly, embarrassing. Luckily, the Democratic leadership is committed to moving forward. This is one of the top priorities of Speaker PELOSI.

We have work that is undertaken in the House Energy and Commerce Committee moving forward with draft legislation which hopefully will be moving on to us in a matter of weeks, if not days. We are poised to work with the House Ways and Means Committee as part of this partnership, and the Obama administration has set down markers and is prepared to act, either administratively or in cooperation with us, with legislation.

This country shook off the Great Depression by mobilizing the economy to fight World War II. We have an opportunity to mobilize against a threat at

least as great—that dealing with global warming—and to harness new technologies, new industries, new products and services to be able to put people to work.

Contrary to what has been suggested, alternative energy—wind, solar, biomass—across the globe are some of the fastest growing industries on Earth. Solar and wind power industries alone have sustained annual growth rates of 30 to 50 percent, creating tens of thousands of jobs while reducing reliance on foreign sources of oil and helping to shrink our carbon emissions.

Now, it is true that these renewable sources today account for less than 3 percent of the world's power generation, but the opportunity here is enormous. We expect that there will be increased energy demands in the United States and around the world, but only about a third of the generation capacity that will be needed to meet expected demand by 2030 has been built.

We have an opportunity to shape and direct how we manage that, to be able to direct it in a way that is going to make the greatest impact on our economy.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, there has been a fair amount of hyperbole about what will be the costs of controlling carbon pollution and moving into a new economic era. The IPCC has been in the forefront of this with the research that's coming forward, and we have had a chance to look at the parameters that they have suggested. In survey after survey of greenhouse gas reduction scenarios undertaken by respected and peer-reviewed modeling groups, there is a projected average GDP reduction of perhaps five-tenths of a percent to three-quarters of a percent to 2030 and 2050, respectively. The estimate is that by 2030, the overall United States gross domestic product is projected to double to some \$26 trillion. Without a cap on greenhouse gas emissions, the United States reaches that doubling by January 2030. With a cap, it reaches that goal 3 months later, April 2030. This is consistent with the research that we have done in Oregon at Portland State University. The State Carbon Allocation Task Force, looking only at the electrical sector, found that while carbon reductions to meet the State's 2020 goal of 10 percent below the 1990 levels would increase energy rates. Under most conditions, average consumer costs would be the same or lower due to cost savings from energy efficiency.

I want to be very clear about this because, contrary to the assumption of some critics sticking to their talking points, any money that is generated from fees on carbon pollution is not somehow buried, it's not shot into space, it's not locked in a vault someplace. This money is used to be able to strengthen our energy infrastructure, and higher prices are further going to encourage efficiency, and last but not least, we will be investing in new prod-

ucts and services in energy-efficient standards. So that as a net result, 20 years from now, at least in our community, it's clear that we're not going to have, as a result of the change in electricity, some massive burden on individual consumers because we will be smart with our investments and people will be smart in terms of what they do, and we anticipate there will be no net increase.

Now, one of the factors that is also important to point out is that we are going to be looking at new technologies and products that leapfrog ahead. Back when we were considering in the Northwest the plans that we were going to make in the 1980s, we didn't actually consider that compact fluorescent light bulbs were going to be a serious lighting efficiency choice, but by the year 2000, these CFLs were widely available. And now, even more efficient lighting technologies, the LEDs, were on the horizon and moving forward. There will be further technological innovation, exactly what we saw when there was a restriction to deal with another gas in the atmosphere, the CFCs, the chlorinated fluorocarbons, that were threatening the ozone. You will recall at that time companies like DuPont threatened that there would be massive disruption, a massive increase in costs, and people would be put out of work. Well, actually, that's not the case. The initiative was taken. Not only were there not massive dislocations, a large increase in unemployment, but companies like DuPont actually made money by producing alternative chemical refrigerants. And surely the same will occur now if we are diligent about our investments.

But more to the point, what's going to happen if we take the alternative that is offered by some and continue with business as usual, to not control carbon emissions, to fall victim to concern about temporary problems with the economy? The report by Sir Nicholas Stern for the Government of the United Kingdom suggests that the mid-rate growth for global emissions are projected to cost 5 percent of the global GDP. A 5 percent loss of the world economic output. Now, actually the trend line is a little more disturbing than what Sir Nicholas Stern came up with because he was just dealing with the mid level of the projections. We have seen that emissions in the last several years have been at or above the high projections in the IPCC fourth report from 2008. And as a result, we have to look at that higher range that was suggested by the Stern report, which could be a 20 percent reduction in global GDP.

The status quo, ignoring the problem, trying to score debate points, roll back the Clean Air Act, and wait poses much more serious problems in terms of what we are likely to see as a consequence. And many of these potential problems are not market related. The effects of this extreme variation, I

have had Members of Congress today joking about the unstable weather here in Washington, D.C., extreme rain, heat, cold. Well, we're seeing global weather instability increasing around the planet. And the droughts, the heavy rains, the windstorms, these carry with them a cost as well.

There are socially potentially disastrous effects that relate to unease and upheaval from drought, fighting over water. There's a whole range of social costs that people need to be thinking about.

There are, I think, very sober voices that should be heard above the talking points. One voice that I find most compelling is that of retired United States Army General Anthony Zinni, who has written: "We will pay to reduce greenhouse gas emissions today or we will pay the price later in military terms, and that will involve human lives."

We are already looking, in my State of Oregon, at the likely adaptation costs. We've got issues relating to flooding, landslides, forest fires, the potential need to relocate highways and other public works. We are facing real threats in our State like they are already being faced by coastal villages in Alaska and in the British countryside of being eaten away by the increase in sea level and storm surges. We are already facing the problems of competition for lower summer stream flows from hydroelectric power, irrigation, navigation, municipal water supplies, and system stream ecosystem needs. We're having a drama being played out now in the State of California with their prolonged drought. That's a taste of what we are looking at in the immediate future if we are unable to act.

We have brought that down in Oregon, a State that has been a leader in efforts to curb greenhouse gasses, to plan for energy futures, an intensely environmentally conscious State. We recently had a study published by the University of Oregon's Climate Leadership Initiative by Echo Northwest, a consulting firm located in Oregon, that estimates the cost to Oregonians by 2020 from the impacts on global warming of \$3.3 billion annually, almost \$2,000 per Oregon household or 2 percent of our current gross domestic product. Put in perspective, that would be the equivalent of a household annual electric rate increase of 175 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these are sobering facts that deal with the highly likely outcomes of our failure to get our arms around this problem and move forward to deal with the problems of greenhouse gas emissions. We need to be serious about opportunities dealing with the savings from energy efficiency. This is an area that we should be doing regardless of greenhouse gas emissions. This is something that is within our power right now.

Part of what is being ignored by critics and their talking points is that all of the major approaches to deal with

greenhouse gas emissions, with the cap-and-trade, would put much of this money back into a system to help people improve energy efficiency. Remember, I mentioned the one study that, in fact, estimates that people would actually be paying less by 2030 than they're paying today, even though electric rates would well go up, because of increased energy efficiency.

We are currently wasting more energy than any other country in the world. The United States is less carbon efficient than 75 out of 107 industrialized countries, and we use the most transportation fuel per passenger mile. There is absolutely no reason that we, as a society, as we are working to create new green collar jobs built on an energy-efficient, carbon-constrained economy for the future, can't take advantage of this to be able to not only reduce power rates in the future, saving Americans money, but put people to work now. We have seen this work in the United States. California has some of the highest electric rates in the country, but over the course of the last 30 years, electric energy efficiency has saved Californians \$56 billion while producing 1½ million new jobs.

□ 1915

The University of California at Berkeley projected savings in jobs from meeting California's Assembly Bill 32 carbon cap-and-trade law. By 2020, they project \$76 billion in saved energy costs at current rates and 400,000 new jobs in California.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunities to move forward to capitalize on energy efficiency is something we want everybody to look at. We have had experience in this area in the Pacific Northwest.

We have engaged in one of the most comprehensive efforts with our northwest power planning council, electric utilities in the Northwest, to try and deal with least-cost energy planning, looking at the big picture. I am proud to say that my hometown of Portland, Oregon, was the first American city with a comprehensive energy policy enacted in 1979.

There has been a lot going on in the Pacific Northwest dealing with energy efficiency. Between 1980 and 2000, the region invested almost \$2.5 billion in energy efficiency. It costs money to be able to move forward on that energy efficiency curve. But during that period of time, the region earned that total investment back once every 18 months.

Let me repeat that: over the course of that 20-year period of time, we invested \$2.4 billion in energy efficiency and the savings, as a result of that investment, were repaid every year and a half. That's a 67 percent average annual rate of return on investment.

This is what we are talking about in terms of being able to move this forward. Now, there are some that suggest, well, you can't do this because it's going to pull the plug on State and local economies; they can't survive

this aggressive push towards energy efficiency.

Well, looking at what has happened in the Pacific Northwest over the last 25 years. That's simply not the fact. Californians have actually had some reasonable economic growth in this period of time. We have had the same in Oregon. By not being intensely carbon based, investing in energy efficiency, we have been able to produce substantial economic benefit while we are growing in a sustainable fashion.

It has resulted in Oregonians, in the metropolitan area of Portland, exporting fewer of their dollars to Houston, Venezuela or Saudi Arabia and, in fact, they have almost \$2,500 a year more disposable income that they are not spending just on transportation alone. This makes a real difference in terms of the initiatives that were made.

In Oregon, we have been working to reduce carbon emissions. Our carbon emissions were 30 percent lower than the national average in 1990, and by working very hard, they are 36 percent lower than 2007. But it's been done without any reduction in our State gross domestic product.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are important points that need to be part of a serious discussion. The status quo, business as usual, head in the sand, we are not going to worry about it now, we are to going to make it a political football is, I think—there may be a time when politics could be played this way. I think the stakes are too high. The American public knows that.

I hope, sooner, rather than later, my friends on the other side of the aisle will understand that this is a serious problem and it invites a serious response.

I hope they will reject the advice of Republican Leader BOEHNER, who has been misusing, for instance, the MIT study repeatedly, despite having had a call to his office's attention how misleading that figure is. But his advice has been to Republicans to not be legislators, but to be communicators, to talk instead of act.

I sincerely hope that that approach will be rejected, because we will be better off, not as a, just as a Congress, we will be better off as a country and as a people if we have broad bipartisan interaction. They may not agree with each and every point, but at least have an honest debate, stop misrepresenting facts and give people permission to be involved with serious efforts to solve this problem.

Because, make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this problem demands attention and it will get attention. One of the most important decisions of the Obama administration is that they were going to start following the law under the Clean Air Act and deal with carbon pollution. This is clear, we are heading down this path.

If Congress doesn't act, we will be dealing with carbon regulation through a combination of administrative action and legal action. It's one way to solve

the problem. I, personally, don't think it's the best, but it's one of the approaches that will be taken.

We find now that there is growing support from leaders in the business community to act seriously to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is a growing consensus among business leaders that now is the time to act, and they are participating with us in serious discussions to craft a workable solution.

It's somewhat ironic that we hear the United States Chamber of Commerce being cited by some to cite that there are problems in opposition to dealing with greenhouse gas cap-and-trade initiatives. Actually, the best research I have seen is that there are only four companies on the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce that are in support of this "just say no" attitude.

Of those companies that have taken a position on the board of directors, 80 percent support Federal regulations with goals to reduce total U.S. global warming pollution, not all in agreement on precisely the response, but Alcoa, Caterpillar, Deere and Company, Dow Chemical Company, Duke Energy, Eastman Kodak Company, Entergy, Fox Entertainment Group, IBM, Lockheed Martin, Nike, PepsiCo, PNM Resources, the Robertson Foundation, Rolls Royce North America, Siemens Corporation, Southern Company, Toyota Motor North America, Xerox. These are all companies that have realized, in many cases, because they are global in nature, that Europe is moving, Japan is moving. Even China is moving on areas of energy efficiency, and there are opportunities for us to work with them, even as they move to be the leader in wind, solar and electric cars.

So major businesses, 80 percent of those on the Chamber board of directors that have taken a position, favor Federal regulation. This is the wave of the future. This is what we as a society need to do.

I am encouraged with the progress that we have made already here in the work under the leadership of the Speaker, of our various committee Chairs, and an active group of Members in the Democratic Caucus moving forward and advancing this debate.

I look forward to having legislation on the floor this year that we can deal with and hopefully enact, working with the administration. I look forward to the United States when it comes to coming together with the global community to deal with climate change in Copenhagen in December.

I look forward to our being there with the United States no longer being missing in action, but, instead, assume its rightful leadership role as the most powerful Nation in the world, as the strongest economy, and, frankly, as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in history that we accept our responsibility, our leadership and move this forward.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening to share

some thoughts. I look forward to our being able to continue the discussion on the floor of the House. I hope, I sincerely hope that we will be able to engage in a thoughtful, deliberate discussion of alternatives that will reduce greenhouse gases, the threat to the planet, strengthen our economy and make a more liveable world for our children and grandchildren.

DEFINING MOMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I appreciate being joined here with my colleague from Illinois to talk about somewhat of a new issue, I think, in the Congress, but more of a broad overview of the situation here in the United States and the situation of the Congress where we might be headed as a country and some new ideas that might be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think during this special time of the references of our current situation to the Great Depression in the 1930s and the FDR administration, how Franklin Roosevelt dealt with those issues and a contract, a social contract that was written during those times that was felt to be necessary in order to deal with the trying times of the day.

And I am not suggesting that the Depression is anything like what we are facing now. We are lucky to not be dealing with 30 percent unemployment, although there are some places in California that have that. Nationally we are not there. But there are some similarities.

And I was reading a book the other day by Jonathan Alter, a very interesting book, called "The Defining Moment." And it was that time during the first 150 days of the FDR administration that it dawned on FDR that he was writing a new social contract.

Jonathan Alter said it well when he wrote: "FDR knew he was on the verge of proposing nothing less than a rewriting of the American social contract. Instead of every man being the captain of his own fate, he envisioned the ship of state carrying a safety net. He favored what he called cradle-to-grave coverage, including national health insurance. But he knew that trying to insulate average Americans from the ravages of the market was a long-term process." So, in public, he borrowed a term from the private sector and spoke vaguely of social insurance.

□ 1930

It dawned on me that having been here a number of years, having had a Republican majority for about 12 years, having thought of reading the signals back in 1994 that the American people wanted a change in their government, and less government, the fact that perhaps during that time a new social contract would have been something that

could have succeeded in achieving those goals while we were in office.

Now, the Republicans, when they came in charge, didn't do what they had promised to do in reducing government, and that has led to us being in the minority now. I think the Republicans get that, and I think we are in a position now where we are trying to assess, where do we go from here? And it dawned on me that it is probably no surprise that we are drawing up these similarities to the Depression and the time for a new deal. We have a President in the White House who has been characterized as the next FDR and very popular and spending money like FDR, but I think that leaves to Republicans the opportunity to define a new social contract, and that interests me.

And I have to go back to times of the contract with America; and that was a contract, but it wasn't necessarily a social contract. It was a political contract. If the American people gave the majority in the House to the Republicans, they would bring 10 bills to the floor, and that was it. It didn't really speak of a social contract in that what government would do and then the rest of society would do as a response to that. It didn't really define a new social contract that we need today.

So I would like to encourage some conversation about that or along those lines. I am so proud to be joined by my friend from Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, and also my friend from South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, to discuss it.

Mr. ROSKAM. If the gentleman would yield. I thank the gentleman for gathering us today and for his leadership, and really having a conversation that I think is very important, Mr. Speaker, to talk about where we are, because my sense is that we are at a very pivotal point in our public life right now and when the types of changes and the types of choices that are being presented to the public are choices that we are going to reflect back in 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 years and say that was the time.

I remember my mother grew up in Oak Park, Illinois, and she was born in 1930. She remembers and I remember her telling me about what it was like for her as a little girl turning on the radio and hearing the voice of Adolph Hitler, and just that sort of ominous feel. And now I am kind of projecting here, but I am imagining that my mother as a little girl sort of knew that there was something that was going on, and that time that she was involved in was formative.

And I would suggest to you, take the World War II reference and abandon it now, and this time that we are in just has a feel about it. It has a poignancy to it, and it has a sense that decisions that are going to be made are going to be made and have long-term implications, and I think that one of a couple of things is going to happen.

My hope and expectation is that we are going to make decisions and we will say, thank goodness that there

were clear-thinking people in Washington at the time that the wheels were coming off the cart. But the alternative is that we surrender so much freedom and we give up so much to a benevolent government that sort of pats us on the head and says: We are going to take care of all your problems. And then we wake up, and when the government fails—and we've seen that time and time and time again lately. We wake up and we don't have those tools that should be ours, and instead they were squandered and they were given away at a time of panic and at a time of legitimate fear.

So here we are on the floor of the House of Representatives, and we are in the midst of this conversation as a country and we have got to look carefully at where we have been and then figure out where we are going. And I think any honest assessment of where we have been takes a look back and says: Okay, United States of America, you have been given an inspired Declaration of Independence. You have been given a Constitution that is the envy of the world. You, as a Nation, and your predecessors have gone through the Civil War. You have gone through the turmoil of slavery. You have gone through world wars. You have gone through a Depression like we were talking about a minute ago. You defeated communism. You defeated fascism, and here you are at this moment where great decisions need to be made. But do so as a Nation with a proud heritage, as a Nation that has understood where it has come from and where it needs to go.

But don't panic. Don't underreact. Don't act as if there are no problems, because there are problems. We know there are great difficulties. We know we have a health care system that is unsustainable. We know that the world is an increasingly dangerous place. We know that the amount of money that is being spent here in Washington begins to feel like generational theft. It really is too much. So we are rightly sobered by these things. But as we are contemplating solutions, we ought not be dismissive of this incredible heritage that we have been given.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think what you just said is very true. The thing I would add to it is that it is also important that we not abandon hope in the midst of that awareness. You just talked about the important awareness of the trials that we are in. We need to be very much aware.

We also, I think, need to approach them with a hope that—well, it depends on where you come from. From my perspective, it is this: The reason I have hope is I believe there is a sovereign God who is in control of all things and, furthermore, I think he is good. So if you put those two things together, I have every reason to be optimistic. Now, I do need to be aware of

the risks that we face and, therefore, respond to them and anticipate them, but also with the hope that America has been through similar kinds of troubles before and met incredible challenges.

Since I serve on the Science Committee and Foreign Affairs, I always mention the scientific kind of things. I am not a scientist. I just play one occasionally on the Science Committee, by the way. But when you think about the things that the United States has done, we finished the transcontinental railroad in the midst of the Civil War. We finished the Panama Canal when the French had abandoned that effort after losing tens of thousands of people to malaria and other causes of death in Panama. We were the nation that fought and won World War II, that very quickly responded to the arms race, to Sputnik, and all of that.

In South Carolina, part of our claim to fame is the Savannah River site was and, as I understand it, still remains the largest construction project in the history of the country. All the stainless steel in the country was going to Aiken, South Carolina, to build the canyons that would develop some of the elements related to our nuclear arsenal, the bomb plant as we call it in South Carolina. Then, in 1961, President Kennedy said we must go to the Moon, make it our goal to go to the Moon before the end of the decade. And we did it, 1969.

So the amazing thing to me is that we accomplished all of those things with technology that now looks very old. The Apollo mission was all designed on the slide rule. Actually, the shuttles were designed on slide rules.

So when you take what America has done with this entrepreneurship, this belief in freedom that the gentleman was just mentioning, and charge that up in the right way so that you marshal those forces and you go out and you conquer these problems, that is what we are about. And I think what our friend just mentioned is very good about the importance of this free enterprise system and the American Dream.

To me, the American Dream is this: It is the fulfilling of the God-given desire to create, to contribute, to care, and to live at peace with one's self, one's neighbors, and one's God. That is the American Dream. And it starts with an understanding that it is the opportunity to do those things, not the guarantee. And that is, I think, what separates us from the other party is they are talking all the time about guarantee. We talk about opportunity. The gentleman from California, I think, talks about opportunity.

Mr. RADANOVICH. It is very interesting. Yes, we do talk about opportunity. But I am reminded about the opening line to *Common Sense*, which was the book written, that sparked the American Revolution, by Thomas Paine. In the very opening sentence he says: Writers have so confused govern-

ment with society as to leave no distinction between the two.

It is a reminder today that there is more than one institution in this country. In fact, if you go back to the Bible, in Genesis there were institutions created there. God said, go forth and multiply; He created the family institution. He said, tend to the garden. He created the business institution. And He said, worship me, which meant love God above all things and love your neighbor as yourself. And then afterwards, Cain killed Abel, and we needed another institution to keep from killing each other, and that was the government, and so we had four.

Even back in the Revolutionary time, there wasn't really a clear idea about what institution did what in society so that we could have the opportunity that we are looking for. Right now, I think, with this New Deal social contract that I believe that we have in place now, which started in the 1930's, Ronald Reagan, the great President that he was, the conservative that he was, still was not able to distinguish between all of those, and the growth of government still happened during that time. The Contract with America wasn't necessarily anything more than a promise to bring 10 bills to the floor. It had its purpose. It was good in many ways, but it didn't address what Thomas Paine thought was the confusion out there about what is government doing, what do we call this remaining society part, and what does it look like, and who does what in this country. Does government raise families or does family raise families? Does government provide jobs or does government protect people and business is the one and should be allowed to provide the jobs and the economy?

And so when we look today at the new administration, the change in majority that we have right now, the growth in the budget, the intention of taking over 17 percent of the business sector and the health care sector, bringing it in under government control and creating a new bubble that will happen, and that is replacing fossil fuels with solar and energy production with massive subsidies that will rack up the national debt like we have never seen, it does make you wonder about whether or not at some point in time the old ATM is going to stop giving out cash. And then what are we going to do? Because we have based our society on a complete reliance of government while ignoring the value of the other institutions, and while relying more on government, we weaken the other institutions. That, I think, is what frightens me the most.

Everybody wants the President to succeed, but we wonder whether he will under the policies that he has adopted. And our hope is there with him, but there is a realistic expectation that if a liberal left policy of dramatically increasing the size and influence of the government is going to collapse upon itself I think at some point in time.

Mr. ROSKAM. I jotted down what you just said: Relying on the government, we weaken these other institutions, and that is really to the point. You know, the gentleman from South Carolina was talking about sort of an orderliness, if I could paraphrase, an orderliness. And I know the three of us and I know every Republican in the House of Representatives recognizes the role of government. There is an appropriate role of government, and the gentleman just gave a glimpse into the seeds of that, and it goes back ancient of times in civilization, and it was to create a structure for fairness and follow-through and an ability to have an expectation of what the ground rules are.

□ 1945

But when government bleeds over into responsibilities that aren't really the government's, and when people give the government that kind of responsibility and ultimately that authority, then you see where this ends up. And it is not a good picture.

Going back again to Genesis, I am reminded of the story of Isaac and his two sons, Esau and Jacob. And as you know, in that Near Eastern culture at that time, the oldest son who was Esau had the birthright. He had the property right. Give me a little grace here. It was about 90 percent ownership expectation that the oldest son was going to get the estate, the cattle and the household. And then the number two son kind of picks up the scraps. That is sort of the way it was in that time. Well, as you know, the account is that Esau comes in out of the field, and he is famished. He is crazy hungry. And we have all been like that. We know what that is like, just being so hungry you can hardly see straight. And his brother, Jacob, the number two son, is cooking some sort of stew. And Esau comes in and says, Give me some stew. And Jacob says, Give me your birthright. And Esau agrees to it. And now I'm collapsing the story down, but Esau gets passed over. He gives up his birthright.

I have this sense that we, as Americans, right now are in a position where we have this birthright that has been given to us not really through work of our own, but it is this birthright that has been entrusted to us. It is the ability to start a company, the ability to innovate, the ability to really capture what it is you want to do; and yet we are being coaxed, as a country, right now by some people who are saying, Give up that birthright. Just give it up. Here. We will give you "stability." And in the name of "stability," many, many people are sacrificing a fundamental birthright. It hasn't happened entirely. But we are sort of on that verge. You get the sense that that is what is beginning to happen.

One of the reasons that I'm a Republican is because I think the Republican Party has this high view ultimately.

Many times it is not articulated well. Many times we bumble along. And we are far from perfect. But do you know what? There is a core there that says, We know what that birthright is. And it is a system that has been the envy of the world that has created more prosperity for more people than the world has ever seen before. And yet we are being told, Just give it up. Just give it up, and you will get stability in exchange.

And I would submit that is a very, very bad deal. And we ought not make that exchange.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INGLIS. And you mentioned "orderliness." I think what we are talking about here in part and what Mr. RADANOVICH has been talking about is the rule of law, the importance of knowing that you can count on the rule of law to allow you to, among other things, enjoy the fruits of your labors. When you trade that away and you don't have that assurance, you have this system like you're talking about where there is stability or there is a guarantee rather than an opportunity. If you don't have the certainty that you can, because of the rule of law, have the certainty of knowing you can enjoy the fruits of your labor, then there is just less labor. It is just the way it is. That is human nature.

Dick Armey, our former majority leader, was the first person I heard say this. He said, "Communism is that system where he who has nothing wants to share it with you." And so it really is a pretty good definition I think of communism. And of course I'm not accusing anyone here of advocating communism. But I do think that when you break this connection between industry, work, labor, and reward, funny things start happening. You lose incentive, and you lose the certainty of reward.

The thing that we do believe in, we Republicans advocate this thing of orderliness, or rule of law, very highly. We value that very highly because there are some economies around the world you can look at where they are blessed with many resources, but yet they lack the rule of law. And as a result, there is no certainty that your work will be rewarded, and, therefore, there just isn't as much work. There isn't as much industry. If you can't own the fruits of your labor, then you labor less. And for some people, this is a real problem. There is a deep philosophical divide that, I think the gentleman here can agree with me, we face a lot. Some people really have a Utopian view of humankind and think that we will some day move beyond this need to have a linkage between work and reward. But I think that what we realize is that, no, you will never break that link. You don't want to break that link. It is just the way it is. And so you want to make clear there is a clear linkage, and then people keep working. They keep innovating.

It is why, for example, we think that economies around the world that steal

our intellectual property are so offensive to us. We think, no, we had people who worked hard, who studied hard, who invested time, energy and capital to create something, and now you have gone and stolen it and are selling it on the streets for \$5 a copy when it really costs a lot more than that to develop. And some people think that is sort of Western imperialism maybe, but I think it is pretty clear that what we are talking about is effort and reward. And you have to keep those together and make opportunity for effort and reward.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I thank the gentleman.

You raise an excellent point, and you speak of the virtue of work. And I'm reminded of virtue. I just have to think about where this virtue that you say comes from, and discussing previously the idea of what other institutions do and what they provide to us in our society. One of those is the issue of virtue. Where does that come from? And there is a chapter in the Bible in Second Peter where it addresses the issue of where freedom and independence come from. And it really starts with faith. And so the growing of that virtue doesn't start here. It starts in the faith institutions. Call it "church," call it "religion," whatever you want to call it; it starts with faith. And that, as outlined in Second Peter, produces virtue which produces freedom and independence. And it all goes into the ability that you describe and that is the desire and the ability to go and reap the rewards of your own labor.

The point I would make in response to yours is that that faith institution has to be really strong in the country because the Founding Fathers relied on it to be the virtue builder in a free society. They restricted government and religion because that had been the forms of tyranny over the last thousand years. Benjamin Franklin was leaving Independence Hall after they signed the Declaration of Independence. Somebody said, What have you given us? He said, Liberty, if you can handle it. And he was really talking about this idea that self-government doesn't come without virtuous people, and virtue originates in a sector that has been beaten down quite a bit. I think that is one of those institutions that has been suffering from Big Government.

I would love to take just a second to illustrate the most artful example and the best form of describing how we love one another as ourselves. It is charity. And if you look at a cross-section of charity in this country, I have identified about \$1.2 trillion of charity that occurs in the United States every year. Americans give about 1.5 to 2 percent of their gross income to charity on average, and that accounts for about \$300 billion a year that goes to churches and nonprofits and the like. Surprisingly, corporations and foundations

only give about \$100 billion a year. That makes \$400 billion. The balance, \$800 billion, comes from government charity, that is the forced levy of taxes on you and me. Twenty-five cents of our tax dollar goes to government charity in the form of Medicaid, food stamps—rack them up—farm subsidies and everything else. It adds up to about 25 cents on every dollar. And if the Founding Fathers were relying on the faith institutions to be the originators of virtue through faith, freedom and independence, it is getting less than one-third of the charity that is operating in this country today, while the lion's share of it goes to government which, at best, can sustain people at where they are.

The story you described about the person who is hungry and the main motivator of going to work and improving your life and doing things better, how can they be motivated when the charity is coming from a government institution that doesn't really encourage them beyond their own current situation and never really educates them on the need to work and why and the benefits of it? So I'm not surprised that there is more of a dependency on government, the growth of government, the overreliance on it, and this trend toward Big Government, because you have to follow the charity money. Frankly there are less of those virtues in this country because the faith institution has been weakened by the growth of government, and they are not able to—and they are the source that brings up this notion of freedom and independence, which is wanting in this country.

Anyway, I was intrigued by your thoughts of how people are motivated to work and what are the original origins of that ethic. And it is severely underfunded and being run over today by government.

Mr. ROSKAM. These choices that we are dealing with remind me of a story I heard about a young woman who was a foreign exchange student here. I forget what country she was from. But she came over here as a high school student or a college student and spent 1 year here like so many foreign exchange students do. And someone asked her, So what did you think? Wind it up for us. What did you think about this year that you spent in America? And what was the thing that made the biggest impression on you? And they were thinking, oh, computers or the highway system or the cool kids at school or whatever some of those predictable things were. But she said something that was very, very unusual. And she said that the biggest impact on her was the number of people who approached her and said, So what are you going to do? What do you want to study? What do you want to grow up and be?

And sometimes we lose track of that. I think that is such a common experience for Americans, an expectation that one generation is going to supersede the next generation in terms of

achievement. But for this girl, it was revolutionary. She came from a culture that didn't really support that, where that wasn't the expectation. And so for her to go around and be reaffirmed on these dreams, that dream of possibility, all of a sudden it was like, wow, I could do a lot of things.

One of my favorite authors is an author named Paul Johnson. Paul Johnson is a living British historian who likes the United States. So it is nice to read his stuff. He really likes America. And in one of his books called "A History of the American People," Paul Johnson talks about our Founders and compares them to the advisers of King George III. And so he goes through this list and he says, basically, you have got this A Team, this unbelievable group of people who founded our country. And you know all the names, Jefferson, Washington, Hamilton, Monroe and Madison and a whole cast of great leaders. And he says that they were such special people, but they were ultimately eclipsing themselves because the combination of them was so great.

And he said there was a second and a third tier of leadership underneath them that in any other generation would have been tier one people, but they just had the dumb luck to be on the scene with this incredible group of talent. And Johnson writes and compares that to the advisers of King George III, the King of England during the Revolution. And I'm overcharacterizing this, but it is as if we weren't playing fair. That is how good our Founders were compared to the leadership on the other side.

And Johnson makes this point: he said all kinds of factors go into history, into how history turns out and how things happen. There are economies. There is weather. There are wars. There are a whole host of things. But ultimately the single most important thing in the determination of history is the people who are in charge at the time—and now this is the PETER ROSKAM footnote—and the choices they make.

□ 2000

And so here we are, we are at this time, almost a tumultuous time in our public life where there is a great deal of fear out there. There is a great deal of anxiety and restlessness. People have been so disappointed for the last couple of months about solutions that they have seen and expectations that Washington and big institutions were going to come through for them. And ultimately, many of those institutions have failed.

One of the reasons that I am here and one of the reasons that I am part of the party that is the Republican Party is because there is that real bedrock of knowledge that, notwithstanding all of the challenges, there is this high view of the individual and a confidence that given a fair set of laws, given a fair shake, given a fair opportunity, there is going to be, on balance, a very good

result. That is not to say we don't have responsibilities because we do. But this view that somehow government is going to come in and make problems go away is, I think, profoundly naive. And we need to be mindful of surrendering so much of our national identity and so much of ourselves to a government that hasn't always deserved our confidence.

Mr. INGLIS. I would add to that, these were exceptional people that you just listed that believed in some very exceptional ideas.

I am a conservative. We are all conservatives here speaking tonight. And to some extent, conservatives are people who sort of want to keep things together the way they are. And I am also conservative philosophically as in wanting to have things like free markets and things like that. But it is also true that at times conservatives are people who want bold change, bold strokes, not just keep it the way it is, we really want to change things.

So those folks you were just mentioning were very bold in believing some pretty audacious things. Like we hold these truths to be self-evident. In other words, they are not going to make any further explanation of it. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That was a bodacious thing to say in 1776. You could say the conservative personality thing was to continue to believe in the divine right of kings. But here were these upstarts in the colonies who said no, listen, we have studied the laws of nature and of nature's God, as Mr. Jefferson said in that document, and we come to a different conclusion. And then he stated the conclusion that we hold these truths to be self-evident. I think it is very exciting just to see how bold they were.

Now fast forward to where we are today, and we have a big challenge. Our challenge today is that our pollsters tell us that for the first time in awhile, maybe in our lifetimes, people don't believe that their children will be better off than they have been. I think that is worth examining and figuring out why that is.

When we started this wonderful adventure here in the United States in 1776 with those incredible words of change and things being self-evident, we carried that on. That was sort of our heritage. As Tom Friedman writes, America is young enough and brash enough to believe that every problem has a solution.

Much of the world has long ago left that nation, but they need us, the Americans, to believe that every problem has a solution. And I would submit that it comes from the DNA we developed in 1776 when we said that all men are created equal. Hello, that is not what the rest of the world thought. And we are endowed by these certain

inalienable rights. That, I would submit, carries through to the thought that yes, by my sacrifice today, or my putting my kids through college or whatever it is, can create for them a better standard of living than mine, which I think is something that has driven this country to its economic success.

It seems to me it is tied in with that DNA and that political understanding, and that comes, as the gentleman from California was saying earlier, was really from a faith understanding. So it really is connected to a series of very big thoughts in America that gets us to the place now of a big challenge, which is do we believe that our children will be better off than we are.

Unfortunately, a big number of our fellow citizens think not. I think it is worth asking, why is that and what can we do to convince them that no, really, America's best days are still ahead if we just stick to these principles, we return to our principles.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I am intrigued by the gentleman from Illinois's thoughts about this person who was so amazed that someone asked her what she wanted to do with her life.

Speaking about the authors of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, how important it is to be able to decide your own fate and be able to choose. And I believe, I think the progress of civilization, it moves from tyranny to self-government. I think we are on that march. There are a lot of bumps along the way and a lot of misconceptions about how order and society ought to be, but I think the beauty of the Declaration of Independence was that government was reined in and religion was put in its place, and after that you had the freedom to be able to—by and large, there were still a lot of problems in the United States even in its beginning, but it was the beginning of that.

In the 1830s, a gentleman by the name of Abraham Kuyper, he was a Calvinist Prime Minister in the Netherlands, he originated a concept. And again, this was while European countries were still figuring out their social contract and who was responsible for what, but he came up with this notion called *coram deo*, a Latin term, but it meant living life in the face of God.

It reminded me of what you said about this young child having her choice. And it was quite a bold statement for the time, but the statement was that government had no authority to be able to limit your freedoms in life, and neither did the church or any other form of authority, that that connection between the individual and God was the supreme connection.

And when Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence that we have the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, what a huge step in moving from tyranny to self-government. This idea of Kuyper and living life in the face of God came afterwards in the 1830s. This

is when Darwin came out with “The Origin of Species” and Karl Marx and fascism and some of these others things were being mulled about. I think he set a new landmark about what are our freedoms. And to me, it further illuminates what a social contract might be, but that that individual had those freedoms.

I can’t help but think in addition to that what the mandates were in the Garden and the ability to create a family, to go to work and worship God and love each other as ourselves, and have a government that protects you, and the freedom to be able to live life in the face of God through those institutions that were built up. Not everybody has those freedoms. Not everybody has a loving father and mother. Not everybody has learned the ability to work or has the ability to go do that. Not everybody has the freedom to worship God and love their neighbor as they wish.

I am kind of intrigued about what a new social contract would look like if we are back to the social contract of cradle to grave by government, government is getting too big, it is likely to come to an end of itself one way or the other. And if that is the case, what do Republicans present? And do you present it in a way that people logically say by golly, I want to go with that.

Mr. ROSKAM. I think that is the great invitation. That is the conversation that we are having with the American public. That is what is such a dynamic part of where we are today.

There was a great theologian in one of the early church fathers, Saint Ambrose, who said we don’t impose on the world; we propose a more excellent way.

I think that is, in part, at the essence of what we are about right now because, you know, we have all seen, everybody knows what a government that is too big and too unwieldily looks like. That story doesn’t end well.

I think about the cartoon “The Jungle Book” with the Walt Disney cartoon and it has the snake, Kaa. The snake, Kaa, is very charming and gets young Mowgli in his eyes, and basically Mowgli becomes transfixed. And Kaa is able to manipulate him. Kaa says “trust in me” and he comes up with a song, and I will spare you in my singing of that song. Ultimately this young Mowgli is completely bewildered. And where does he end up? He ends up in the coils of Kaa, the boa snake.

I think there is a little bit of wow, that sounds really great. That program sounds good and that sounds like something that is great and stable, but my fear is and my hesitancy is that to surrender what the American public is being asked to surrender by, with all due respect the Democratic leadership in this Congress, is, I think, regrettable. The amount of money. And it is being done gently. It is being done very smoothly. It is being done cleverly, if I might say so; but it is being done in

such a way to basically coax people into surrendering things which I think they will do so with great regret.

I think the invitation is come along on this more excellent way. Come along on a way that says we acknowledge the difficulties of where we are. And we are rightly sobered by the challenges our country faces today. None of us here on this floor are pumping sunshine, acting as if everything is great, because it is not great. We are really sobered by the challenges we face.

But notwithstanding those challenges, we don’t panic and we don’t surrender freedoms that are our birthright. In the exchange, we end up with some sort of stability that I think is going to be completely unsatisfying in the long run.

Getting back, I think the gentleman from South Carolina and the observations he made about sort of the predictability of contract and the work ethic, not long ago I was traveling in another country that doesn’t have a good solid rule of law. And the officials that we met with were talking about the issue that they characterized known as impunity, meaning you could commit crimes with impunity. You can do it and get away with it.

One of the countries that is in this hemisphere has a murder conviction rate of 3 percent. Think about that, 3 percent of the murders that occur in that country end up in a conviction.

What does that mean? If you can commit murder with impunity, what does that mean for somebody trying to start a business? What does that mean to try and enforce a contract, or stand up for your rights as an entrepreneur and get things going? And I would submit to you it is almost impossible. And many of these problems that we see around the world, not all of them, but many of them are exacerbated by this idea of impunity, the ability to just do whatever you want.

So here we are. We are having a conversation as a country right now about what do contracts mean? What does it mean when you sign a piece of paper? We have seen coming out of the White House some very aggressive moves trying to rewrite contracts. Again, I would submit, over an extended period of time, that is a scene that doesn’t end well either. In the short term, that can be very satisfying if you are on the right side of that deal. But at some point in the future, you may not be on the right side of that deal.

Ultimately, what does it do? It creates a disincentive for people to put themselves at risk. It creates a disincentive for people to be creative. What we need at this time in our history, with all of the challenges that we have, a whole host of things, the economy and everything, we need our best and brightest leaning into this thing.

□ 2015

We need people saying, “You know what? I’m here. I want to participate. And I know if I do, there is a reward for

me, and it’s a reward that is borne of my innovation and my entrepreneurship and my willingness to put myself and my capital at risk.”

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have been describing here, I think, as the gentleman from California really started us off with the idea of what we really deeply believe with our faith really gives us a concept of respect for individual rights and the need to protect those rights. And then we have talked some about the dignity of work and protecting and affirming that dignity through the rule of law. The gentleman from Illinois was just mentioning that.

That leads us to policies. And these all flow from that deep well of what we really deeply believe and then it comes up to the surface level of instant policy or the policies of today—the policy questions of today.

The one that I think we need to answer is: Is it possible for our children to live a better life economically than we have? I think the answer is yes, as long as we do what we know works, and that is to have a system of taxation that is not confiscatory, that allows you to keep the rewards of your work. So you want to keep taxes relatively low. You want to keep regulation relatively light and effective, not burdensome, not a gotcha, but rather calculated to produce results that are reasonable, and light touch.

Then, you have got to reduce litigation somehow so that there is some certainty that you will not lose what you have done by becoming somehow the guarantor of someone else’s outcome. You can’t ask somebody else to guarantee their outcome. If you do that, that is the way you end up with too much litigation, and the result is that people move productive capacity away from a developed nation to an undeveloped nation.

They decide, “Well, we will go take our risk with a less established rule of law, because in the developed country which had this rule of law, you now have such high taxation, regulation, litigation, it’s too much risk for us. We are not going to get the reward.”

So, for us, really what it is, is a matter—to answer that question, whether our children’s future can be brighter than ours, the answer is yes, if the top level here on what bubbles up to policy—if we keep taxes relatively low, keep regulation relatively light, and we keep litigation down, the result will be people will want to do business here and there will be opportunities for our children and our grandchildren.

I’d be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I know the gentleman holds in such high esteem the words of the Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, and what a wonderful contribution to the world that was, but I can’t help but think what Thomas

Jefferson might have worded differently had he gone through the sixties—had he been a flower child in the sixties or had he lived through the Great Depression; the collapse of business the way it did.

I think what I admire the most about what they did was the reining in of government and religion and putting them in their proper place. There was the assumption that, as Thomas Paine said, the rest of society would be families and business and they would operate according to the norms.

I'm not one of those people that say we have got to get back to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, we have got to get back to our founding principles, because I think this is more about looking forward with new illumination built on that.

But what I find interesting is that, had Thomas Jefferson gone through the Great Depression or was a hippie in the sixties, or at least was around when that was happening, would he have reworded life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness a little different. I wonder.

Would he have made a statement about the need for every child to have a mom and a dad, or, you know, the need for business to not be taken up by wrong principles and end up in collapse, and what would have been his advice on how to deal with the Great Depression?

The bottom line is: Would he have worded those opening lines of the Declaration of Independence any different? And I don't have the answer, but it would have been interesting to have a conversation with him today, where he has the knowledge of what occurred after that.

Not that I would ever suggest that it needs to be rewritten, but it does speak to me of perhaps some new inalienable rights that have been illuminated since then because of the history of the United States and what has happened over time and what we have experienced and what our world has become and the results of new knowledge, new science. So, I wonder.

I think it's kind of interesting because we have the opportunity, I think, in the form of a new social contract, to plow new ground and to be bold to develop a contract that really does speak to and contribute to this rise of out of tyranny to self-government. We're not there with self-government yet.

I think the gentleman from Illinois references things that are at risk. I really do believe it's the leadership we provided in the world since the foundation of the country and the Declaration of Independence and the statement of rights that we are going to lose if we are overly reliant on a large Federal Government that has increased dramatically in these last few months at the expense of these other institutions, including business, that is more encumbered daily and provides less incentive to go out and do the things that we have talked about—going out and prospering and earning an income and

taking care of yourself, and benefiting from it, as well as families and the virtue-building power of faith.

I think that is what we stand to lose. I sure don't want that to happen.

Mr. ROSKAM. I think one of the things that we find ourselves in this quandary as Americans is sort of a gotcha mentality, right? The gentleman from South Carolina referenced that a minute ago. I think of my fourth-grade teacher. My fourth-grade teacher's name was Lillian Anderson. She was a dear woman. I had her her last year, which you can interpret as I drove her to retirement, I suppose.

Ms. Anderson was one of those teachers, though, when you would go and do work, she would come back and make the corrections. And it was sort of a gentle way. I mean, she would look at the report and, "Oh, Peter, you didn't indent this." We've all gotten those marked-up papers from teachers.

So you think about American businesses today who are looking at a regulation. They have an assignment. They have a law that is passed by Congress, and then some Federal agency has come up with a rule interpreting that law. As we know—we have all dealt with constituents—some of the laws are clear as mud, and some of the rules are even worse.

So you're a small business owner, you're a big business owner, whoever, and you're not sure what the rule means, and you're doing your best. You are legitimately doing your best. And you realize, "You know what? We've messed this up. It wasn't through malice, it wasn't through manipulation, it wasn't through cheating or deception. It's an honest mistake."

Well, other countries have figured this out. Other countries have created a regulatory environment that is not a gotcha environment. Other countries have figured out you can go to a regulator and say, "Look, this is what we're doing. This is how we're interpreting this rule. Are we doing the right thing?" And in these other countries they will look at it and say, "No, you're not doing the right thing. Here's the right thing to do. Don't do this anymore. And if you do this in the future, you will be punished, but we acknowledge that it wasn't intentional and you're not trying to deceive or defraud anybody."

Can you do that the United States of America under this current environment in our country? No. If you're doing something on balance and you have an ambiguity about it, 9 chances out of 10, you're crazy if you go to a regulator and say, "You know what? This is what we're doing. What do you think?" They will come back to you and say, "You have the right to remain silent." And we know the Miranda rights. It makes no sense.

So what we have got to do, I think, in this country in order to create prosperity and in order to create an environment where we are regulating for the right things instead of regulating

for the sake of regulating—and there's a big difference there. If we're regulating for the right things, that means someone can come in and say, "Look, we're doing this," and the regulator says, "Don't do that anymore." Or, alternatively, "Yeah, you're doing the right thing. Proceed. Off with you. And be lively."

I think there is an attitude that has to develop in the United States. And I think Republicans that I have interacted with in the House of Representatives get it. They get the idea that government is not supposed to come along with a heavy hand, to go back to the gentleman from South Carolina's language, with a heavy hand and come in and just pound and pound and pound and just take the life right out of some entrepreneur or somebody who's self-employed or starting something up.

But instead, it's supposed to come in with a light touch. And if there is a legitimate area where there's wrongdoing, then we all agree there needs to be a reconciliation to that.

So none of us are saying, "Don't punish the wrongdoer," but there is an attitude, there is a way to get to that point that honors business people and honors and recognizes that people that are starting companies in all of our districts. They are the ones that are putting capital at risk, they are the ones that are working. They don't have lobbyists that are coming here to Washington, D.C. They are not represented here, except by us.

I think that as we are moving forward, we ought not fall into sort of this harsh language—harsh antibusiness language—that we see coming out of the leadership on the other side of the aisle that actually has a very low view and paints everybody with a bad brush.

Are there some bad actors? There sure are. Are there people that need to be punished? There sure are. But let's not drag business through the mud with an expectation that an entrepreneur or somebody who wants to work hard isn't well motivated. I think that that sort of degrading of business is a point that we need to be very, very mindful of.

I know our witching hour is approaching.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, may we inquire of the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. INGLIS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California, who started us off on a high note. We went from high notes to policy, and now we're back to a high note, maybe, for conclusion.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I appreciate the time from the gentleman from South Carolina. I think I would just leave with the note that the social contract that we are operating with right now is cradle to grave. It started during the Depression. We're back at it with full force now.

If we were to create a new social contract, what would it look like, in opposition to something like that? If we were to hold up to the American public a different social contract, try to imagine—and I'd even implore the public to do this, too—what would the alternative look like? I think it's something to think about. Because we are obviously unsustainable for the rest.

I just want to send my prayers to a colleague here who is away on a family matter and couldn't join us tonight.

H1N1 INFLUENZA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address my colleagues for the best part of the next hour.

What we are going to do, Madam Speaker, is talk about this current virus that is going around that we are now referring to as type A H1N1 influenza. I think most people would understand better if we said swine flu. Now I understand why we are trying to get away from calling it swine flu, and obviously in States across the country where the pork industry is hugely important to the economy, they don't want this fear—unwarranted fear, really—of consuming pork products that are completely safe. Obviously, you have known from almost childhood that pork should be well cooked to a temperature of 160 degrees and it's perfectly safe.

□ 2030

But that is the reason why I am going to stand here tonight and probably not use the term "swine flu" very much, because I don't want to create an unnecessary fear of a very, very safe product that could be harmful to States across this country and to other countries as well. We are in a tough time economically on a global scale, and we don't want to make those matters worse by creating a false sense of concern.

I will be joined, Madam Speaker, this evening by a colleague or two—or three or four maybe—who are part of the GOP Doctors Caucus. We formed this caucus at the beginning of this Congress, the 111th, as we grew our numbers of health care providers in their previous life who now have morphed into Members of this great body of the House of Representatives. We have that really on both sides of the aisle, but this is a Republican hour, Madam Speaker, and I will be joined by other Republicans. I would welcome, if any of my Democratic friends, health care providers, are sitting in their offices watching us on television on C-SPAN, if they want to come over and join us and weigh in on this, I would be glad to yield them time.

There is no partisanship involved here. The purpose is to try to inform

our colleagues, all 435 in the House, so that they can inform their constituents. And each one, as you know, Madam Speaker, represents almost 700,000 people in their respective districts. And we are all getting calls. I mean, people are scared.

I would say that some fear is warranted, but a pandemic of panic is not warranted. And so the more information that we, as Members of Congress, can give to our constituents and that our staff can give when they call the office, either here in Washington or in our district offices, then we get to keep this thing in its proper perspective. And that is my purpose tonight, and that is the purpose of my colleagues that will be joining me later in the hour to talk about this issue and to make sure that people have enough information that they can take care of themselves and their children, or maybe their elderly parents, or possibly someone in the family whose immune system is compromised so that they know what to do, they know what the risks are, they know what their government is doing.

And, Madam Speaker, I want to commend and compliment the Federal Government and our respective State health departments, the Centers for Disease Control in my great State of Georgia, which, as you know, is an integral part of the Department of Health and Human Services and is really the lead agency, if you will, in regard to infectious disease, communicable disease, epidemiology. And Interim Director Dr. Besser and previously the Director of CDC, Dr. Julie Gerberding, these are the kinds of people, both with experience in infectious disease—in fact, Dr. Gerberding, internal medicine specialist, subspecialty being infectious disease. It is comforting to know that these kinds of professionals are standing guard, they are watching our back.

We had a hearing last week when, both Republicans and Democrats, the new Secretary, the day after she was confirmed, Kathleen Sebelius, former Governor of Kansas and now Secretary of Health and Human Services, former Governor of Arizona, Janet Napolitano, now Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, and Admiral Schuchat from the CDC, all spoke to us and told Members of Congress exactly what the plan was and what was being done and what is currently being done in regard to this impending pandemic. We are pleased, a week later, to find out that things are much better today on, what is it, the 5th of May, than they were a week ago or 2 weeks ago. And it looks like we are not, Madam Speaker, going to have a pandemic of this potentially very virulent virus that has occurred in our past history.

We will talk a little bit maybe about what happened in 1918, when 50 million people across the world died from influenza. Of course that was a different time. It probably started in the United States in very confined quarters as

men were training to be rushed into the battle of the great war, World War I, and in very close contact. But of course back then there were no vaccinations against any kind of flu, seasonal flu, avian flu, this current type, H1N1 influenza virus, no vaccine, and more importantly, Madam Speaker, no antibiotics. It was not until 1941, I think, or thereabouts, that penicillin was discovered.

So you really had no effective way of treating complications, and of course the complications that would lead to death. And let's say even the 35,000 deaths that occur today following just regular seasonal flu, complications from seasonal flu, they are respiratory; it's pneumonia, it's sepsis. And back in 1918 I don't think there were any respirators that I'm aware of. I don't think that's true. My colleague from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROWN, a family practitioner, has joined me. And when I yield time to him, we can talk about that in a colloquy about what was available.

But I think we could compare the current situation, this 2009 concern over this influenza, to 1976, when a very similar virus struck—again, originated in a military facility; I think it was Fort Dix. There was, I think, at least one death, and five soldiers came down with this type A influenza, H1N1, very similar—I said I wasn't going to say swine flu, but very similar to what we are looking at today.

Back then, a vaccine was developed very specifically, and we started a big vaccine program. I think 50 million people in 1976 during the Ford administration were vaccinated against this virus. In retrospect, it may have not been necessary. And finally that program of vaccinating everybody was canceled because of complications. We had more complications really from the vaccine than we did from the flu. And I say that not to suggest today that we shouldn't prepare ourselves—and again, I compliment the respective Secretaries in the CDC and the States that are ready. And they are ready, and people should be very comforted by that. But we need to question how much money we spend. Is it appropriate to, let's say, spend \$2 billion in the upcoming emergency supplemental that is primarily for the ongoing cost of trying to win in Iraq and Afghanistan, a very important spending that is probably going to end up being \$90-plus billion in this emergency supplemental? But whether or not we need to spend \$2 billion specifically in this emergency supplemental on developing a vaccine and vaccinating 50 million people like we did back in 1976, there is some question in my mind, as a physician who practiced for 30 years, although not infectious disease, but I do have some concerns that we don't overreact and that we make sure that we have a measured response.

The President has an obligation to do that. And I can understand that he doesn't want to take this too lightly.

I'm sure he remembers Katrina just as we all do. I will use the expression, he doesn't want to get "Katrina'ed" over this issue by not responding appropriately. And I do understand, and I think we all understand what I'm talking about when I say that. But we will spend the best part of an hour talking about this issue.

I have got just a very few posters that I want to share with my colleagues, Madam Speaker, before yielding to Dr. BROUN, the great physician Member from Athens, Georgia.

This first slide is referencing that outbreak that occurred back in 1976. And again, it was very similar. The serotype, the specificity of the virus then was very similar to this 2009 outbreak. Five soldiers at Fort Dix, New Jersey, I believe—contracted H1N1 influenza and one soldier died. Tests on many more—of course I'm sure everybody at the base was tested for this virus, and it confirmed that 500 actually were infected, but most of them really showed no noticeable symptoms. I mean, they may have had a sore throat, they may have had what we call rhinorrhea—technical name for runny nose, sneezing and body aches and things like that—but they really showed no severe symptoms. And over the following months, no other Americans died from that virus. The loss of one life, of course, is one life too many, especially for the family of that individual, but clearly things kind of resolved themselves in pretty quick fashion. And as I say, no other Americans died from the virus.

But the inoculation that we did develop—and I think I may have this included on the slide, Madam Speaker—but we spent \$135 million developing a vaccine. That was back in 1976, 1977, what, almost 40 years ago. And we have just appropriated or are on the verge of appropriating \$2 billion to our response to this flu. And it may be that a lot of that expense will be developing a vaccine. And it is possible, if we do that, develop a vaccine in mass quantities, that we will never use it. Because remember in this experience, where the complications from the vaccine—and I want to talk about that just briefly—might end up being worse than the disease itself.

So as I say, in 1976, this \$135 million—that was a lot of money back then—developing this vaccine and inoculating 50 million people, the vaccinations began on October 1, 1976, and by December 16—so we're talking, what, 2½ months later—the Federal Government decided we needed to suspend this program because there were increasing reports, Madam Speaker, of side effects. And I am not talking about just a little swelling or rash or itch at the injection, the vaccination site. I'm talking about some serious things. In fact, I want to talk about one thing in particular.

But there were some deaths attributed to the vaccine; 50 million people received the vaccine. And one of the

side effects was a very serious condition, Madam Speaker, called Guillain-Barre syndrome. I don't know who Guillain was and I don't know who Barre was, but maybe Dr. BROUN will tell us about that. But it was named after some very—not American physicians. But this Guillain-Barre syndrome is a paralysis that occurs, and it literally causes paralysis from the neck down. And these people couldn't survive back in 1918, certainly, but even today without the aid of a respirator.

The good news is this condition usually goes away and they recover full function, but it can take as long as a year. And some of these patients spend most of that year in a hospital, away from their families, away from their jobs, and many months on a respirator so they can even breathe.

So this was a very, very serious complication, Madam Speaker, from these vaccinations that were developed back in 1976 to treat this very similar virus that we are facing today.

□ 2045

So what happened is pretty quickly the vaccination program was suspended. And then you have to say, well, was that \$135 million well spent? I think maybe in retrospect, but you have to be careful about saying, well, you know, don't do this or don't do that, that it looks like this is not going to be a very serious flu, that it's not going to be even, Madam Speaker, as serious as seasonal flu, and there's just going to be a few people sick in a few States and maybe other countries as well, but it's not going to be a pandemic. And maybe if we have the money available to produce a vaccine in mass quantities, the decision very well could be not to do that, and then we will be able to return some of that money, maybe most of that money, to the taxpayer. Maybe we'll be able to spend it on something that's equally as important or maybe even more important. But that's a subject for debate, and I realize that you have to be very careful about saying that we don't need to do anything because clearly we do, and I think we are doing a lot.

At this point I want to yield to my colleague from Georgia, who represents Athens and my home of Augusta, Georgia, and he does it very well, and that's my colleague and fellow physician, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY, for yielding.

As you were discussing the past flu epidemics and the 1976 swine flu that happened back then, I was practicing medicine in rural southwest Georgia. At the time, of course, the recommendations were for everybody in this country to get a swine flu vaccine. As a practitioner, I was concerned about that, and I was asked by many of my own patients should they get this flu vaccine. And, frankly, I was not recommending it because, as I looked at the data that were available at that

time, I just really questioned the wisdom of exposing people to the vaccine. So I was not recommending it to my own patients. I did not get the vaccine myself. And actually, in my practice, which was a very busy general practice in rural southwest Georgia, I did not have one single patient come down with swine flu, not the first one. But I had several patients get Guillain-Barre syndrome from the vaccine. One was a good friend of mine who was a newspaper publisher in the community, and he struggled and his family struggled with his paralysis. But people died.

A lot of folks don't consider that these vaccines aren't innocuous. There are side effects and can be tragic side effects and can lead to death. More people died from the vaccine than died from the swine flu back then.

Just Monday I was chairing a facility at the vet school at the University of Georgia, in Athens, Georgia, and went into a biocontainment lab, a level 3 biocontainment lab. There's a researcher there who's doing probably the cutting-edge technology research on this infection that we have out in the public today. He came from the CDC before he came to the University of Georgia, and he deals with these viruses. They have some pretty potent viruses in their laboratory there. And he told me that a week ago he was telling the CDC and the people in the Federal Government, anybody who would listen, NIH, et cetera, that this virus did not have the characteristics of being what we call in medicine a very virulent virus. In other words, it was not one that was going to create a lot of infections and severe infections in this country.

I asked him, why do we see in Mexico people dying at a greater rate than we do here? And he said, well, we really don't have the data of how many people are infected down there. But from what he could ascertain, and he was part of the group who was studying the virus in Mexico, and he said that down there the people who are getting the virus, this current infection, and who were having severe difficulties and were dying principally were people that had other what we in medicine call comorbid conditions. In other words, they had respiratory problems. They had other illnesses that created a problem where they would develop secondary infections and die.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If I could reclaim my time for just a second and yield right back to him, he brought up a very important point, Madam Speaker.

There have been two deaths in the United States thus far attributed to the current version of this same virus, H1N1 influenza type A. One was a 2-year-old toddler, a Mexican national, who came to Texas for a visit and was actually sick before, and I think this was a little boy, before they came into Texas, and subsequently the child died in Houston in the hospital. And what you get from the news releases, from

the press releases, is that it says that the child had multiple health problems before developing the flu. And now we just heard, and I'm not sure if Dr. BROUN is aware of this, but another death has occurred. This was an adult woman, I believe, also in Texas that lived in a border town very close to the Mexican-Texas border. And also it says this woman that died had multiple health problems.

Now, Dr. BROUN and I are physicians. When you start talking about multiple health problems, are you speaking of metastatic cancer, as an example? Maybe somebody who had breast cancer that had spread to other parts of her body? Possibly. Are you talking about somebody that has coronary artery disease and has had three or four heart attacks and a bypass procedure done who is in congestive heart failure? Are you talking about somebody who has severe type 2 diabetes who is on insulin, who is on dialysis because of renal failure?

I mean, I think the media has a responsibility here that they are not fulfilling because they don't give you the whole story, and I think it's very important that we get that so we understand what the true risk is and how severe the flu is.

And I yield back to my colleague, but I wanted to make sure people understand these two deaths, these were sick people: one, a very young child; another, a past middle-age adult woman who had health problems. "Comorbidity" is the term that my colleague used.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's bringing that up.

You're exactly right. Any death is tragic and we in medicine try to prevent all deaths. When I graduated from the medical college in Georgia just like you did, I think you were a year ahead of me there in Augusta or maybe two, but I took the Hippocratic oath. They don't do that in medical school because the Hippocratic oath says, "I shall do no harm," and it says "I shall not perform an abortion," and *Roe v. Wade* has changed that; so medical schools are not taking the Hippocratic oath anymore because there are doctors that are doing harm. They're killing babies through abortion. I am very pro-life, and I know that life begins at fertilization, and I want to protect all life. And it's tragic whenever a life is taken, whether it's an unborn child or whether it's a 23-month-old child that died like this one from this H1N1 type A flu or whether it's an elderly person. But what happens, and particularly has happened in this case, is I think the gentleman is exactly right that the media has overblown this.

There is a lot of misunderstanding when the World Health Organization, the WHO, says there is a pandemic. What does that mean? Most people in America think, well, people are going to be dying in wholesale lots all over this country as they did in the early part of the last century. Well, the

World Health Organization, when they talk about a pandemic, they just mean there's flu in multiple areas, and it doesn't mean that people are going to be dying. In fact, the flu in America has been very mild. Most people, as it was in 1976, who have contracted the flu go about their business. And that is a danger in that people, if they start running a fever, they need to stay home, whether it's with this flu episode or any flu episode. They need to take care of themselves. If they run a fever more than a day or two, as a primary care physician, I would tell them they need to see their physician. Now, they don't need to take antibiotics.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Let me reclaim my time to make a request, Madam Speaker, of Dr. BROUN, because I think that our colleagues and their constituents really need as much information as they can possibly get.

The media creates a near hysteria situation, and then when, of course, the fires are going out and there's no longer a crisis, then they are on to the next story. I can tell you that I was scheduled on several national opportunities to talk about this issue when it was the news du jour. Then all of a sudden when things get better, they just say we don't need you anymore because we're on to another story and there's a runaway teenager somewhere or some other more exciting story.

But I think, Madam Speaker, it would be great if Dr. BROUN and anybody that joins us later in the hour could tell us exactly what you would do as a physician, as a health care provider, when someone comes to your office and they either have some symptoms, they think they might have the flu, or maybe they just come because they have heard that they ought to be taking Tamiflu or Relenza. They're not sick yet, but they think, well, maybe if I get on some medication ahead of time that I can somehow prevent this and I owe it to my children to get a prescription from Dr. BROUN.

Would you talk about that for us?

I think, Madam Speaker, if we can have Dr. BROUN do that, it would be very helpful for people to understand what they should do.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Certainly I would be happy to discuss how I approach patients. In fact, I've had patients come in and say, Dr. BROUN, I don't want to get the flu. I want some Tamiflu or I want Relenza. And, frankly, taking it prophylactically may help, but the thing that we are doing is we are spending a lot of money to take that, and once they take the preventative, if just a few weeks later they get exposed, then they could still get the flu. It doesn't have a lasting effect.

So what we do know is that taking these antivirals like Tamiflu and Relenza, if you take those very early on in the course when people first start getting a fever, when they first start aching all over, when they first start getting the runny nose and the cough and the sore throat, if they'll go to

their doctor then and be evaluated to see if they indeed do have the flu and then get on the medicines, that's the best way, most cost-effective way of treating this.

Now, a lot of patients will come in the office and say, I've got the flu, I want antibiotics, or they'll call on the phone and say, Dr. BROUN, I'm running a fever, I need an antibiotic. Well, most fevers aren't susceptible to antibiotics because most fevers are due to viral illnesses. Even allergies can cause fevers. Fever in itself doesn't indicate that a patient needs an antibiotic.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. What you're saying, Dr. BROUN, is that antibiotics are not really effective in treating a viral illness.

And I want to ask another question of the doctor, Madam Speaker.

Does everybody that goes to see their family doctor, primary care physician, infectious disease specialist maybe, does every one of them, if they have symptoms, runny nose, aching a little bit, maybe a low-grade fever, headache, whatever, do they all need to be cultured for this particular H1N1 type A influenza virus? Do they all need to have a culture done? Respond to that, if you would, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. No, I would say that they don't need a culture unless they're at high risk. In other words, if they had been in Mexico, particularly Mexico City, which is apparently where the nidus of this infection began—we don't really know for sure, but if people have been in Mexico City, if it's within the incubation period, which is about a week, and start running a fever, then maybe it is a good idea for them to have the culture done or the flu test done to see if this is indeed the swine flu.

□ 2100

But the thing is, the treatment that they are going to get, even if they have the H1N1 flu is not any different than if they have any other of the viruses. The big question is, do they need antibiotics or not? Do they need the antiviral, the Tamiflu-Relenza types of medications, or are they better off with penicillin or some of these other high-powered drugs that are on the market today?

And a CBC, a complete blood count, will help the doctor to understand whether they have a viral infection or bacterial infection. If their white blood count is high, if they have what we say is a left shift, in other words if they have types of white blood cells that indicate a bacterial infection, then they do need antibiotics. They do need a bacterial culture just to see if any of the antibiotics that the doctor prescribes are going to eradicate that particular bacteria.

But as I mentioned earlier, most fevers, most colds, most pneumonias, most bronchitis, most ear infections are not caused by bacterial infections. So utilizing antibiotics in those cases is a huge waste of money, it exposes

the patients to developing allergies to those antibiotics. Plus, it also sets up a situation where people can develop a superinfection.

So they need to be evaluated, but let the doctor direct how that care is going on. Hopefully, that answers your question.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. It does. I want to continue this colloquy, Madam Speaker, with Dr. BROUN, because, if, as Dr. BROUN said, every person that comes in that office that thinks that they may have the flu, not seasonal flu, but this flu that everybody is panicking over, that, you know, the doctor, Dr. BROUN, you correct me if I am wrong, but the doctor is going to do a physical examination on that patient. They are going to look at the throat, the tonsils where strep throat can occur.

They are going to listen to the lungs; they are going to use that stethoscope. They are going to make sure that patient doesn't have pneumonia. And they are going to make an evaluation. As Dr. BROUN was saying, it's the very young or the very elderly or somebody that's immune compromised, the approach may be a little bit different.

But this Tamiflu, which is a pill or capsule, and this Relenza, which is a nasal aspirate, they are as effective 2 or 3 days later, I think certainly if they are administered within 48 hours. So, Dr. BROUN, you might say to those folks that they are real nervous about, well, look, we are going to treat this symptomatically, and probably not with an antibiotic, as Dr. BROUN said.

And if in 24 to 48 hours your child is getting worse, then, absolutely, you come right back here to my office, I believe available 24 hours a day. That's the way we practiced when Dr. BROUN and I were practicing, and we will then go ahead and do a culture and start your child or your mom or your dad or your mother or your sister or your wife or husband, we will put them on the antiviral, the Tamiflu or the Relenza. And then we will kind of wait and see what the culture shows.

So there is time. What Dr. BROUN is talking about is treating people, using your brain and using your skills and not wasting precious medication if you don't need to.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. You are exactly right, Dr. GINGREY. Putting people on antibiotics or just taking Tamiflu because you are scared is not a good utilization of your money. And certainly the health system is overburdened by the misuse or overuse of antibiotics and all kinds of drugs.

But you brought up a good point too that I wanted to focus on just a second.

And the thing is, if a child starts or a person, adult, starts running a fever, if they don't have any other health problems, if they don't have chronic lung disease, if they don't have severe asthma or chronic bronchitis, if they don't have diabetes where they are more liable to develop infection, secondary infections, if somebody is basi-

cally healthy, then waiting for 24 hours is not going to hurt those healthy people, in all likelihood. It's worthwhile monitoring that patient, just seeing what they do, treating the fever with some Tylenol or Advil, one of those types of medicine.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If I could make one point, we are not talking about meningitis here. It's not meningitis. It can be a severe illness, as Dr. BROUN says, but it's not going to kill you within 24 hours. And I think you are approaching it the way Dr. BROUN is describing.

I didn't mean to interrupt him, Madam Speaker, but I thought it was important that people understand because people do know about situations where somebody was perfectly well one day and dead the next from meningococcal meningitis, a bacterial infection, not a viral infection. Viral meningitis usually just causes a severe headache and is time limited. I thought it was important to make that point.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The gentleman is exactly right. The severity of the illness makes a big difference. Dr. GINGREY, you had been talking about the doctor taking the time to do a history and physical, which is extremely important. I want to point out here, just to go off on a tangent for just a moment, as we see what the majority here in this House is trying to propose, this push towards socialized medicine, doctors aren't going to have time to take a proper history and physical because they are going to be pushed to ration care.

And so that socialized medicine that's being pushed by the leadership in the House and the Senate is not the way to go, and it's going to hurt people more than help people. And it's going to be disastrous economically.

But getting back to the flu, if somebody is concerned, they need to look at the possibility of this person having the flu. My daughter called me up just the other day when this was so hot in the news, and she was concerned she might have the flu. Well, she is a stay-at-home mom. She hasn't been out to be exposed to anybody where she would get the flu.

So people need to have a little common sense about this as they think about this. Just because it's in the news doesn't mean that they are going to get it. Just because WHO is saying that there is a pandemic, that just means that people in multiple areas have the flu, and it doesn't mean that people are going to be dying in wholesale lots.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Absolutely, you are right, and you pointed out this earlier, Dr. BROUN did, that a pandemic just means that it has spread to the point that multiple countries are involved, and they are talking about the volume of cases, not necessarily the severity.

And they, by the way, so our colleagues can understand this and advise their constituents when they call, the

World Health Organization has not declared a pandemic.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. That's correct.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. They have declared a category 5, which is one step from saying there is a pandemic. I don't believe they are going to get to category 6 and make that declaration, as things have improved. I mean, that is not wishful thinking on my part. I understand that it could go the other way, but I don't think it will.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, you are exactly right. And we have had over 400 cases that have been reported here. In fact, there have been several cases in our own State of Georgia that have been diagnosed serologically, which means through the testing that they do, indeed, have the type-A H1N1 flu, but in most cases it's very mild.

And the people that are dying, this 23-month-old infant, as well as the lady in Texas, both by reports, we don't know for sure, by reports, those people had other conditions that led them to have the possibility of secondary infections.

The way I remind my colleague—I don't have to remind my colleague, because he knows very well that the way people die from flu is through pneumonia, through respiratory difficulties and, and they will develop severe respiratory stress syndrome or some other types of respiratory problems or will develop pneumonia and die from the pneumonia. Frequently, it's a bacterial pneumonia with these co-morbid, as we say in medicine, conditions that give them the greater possibility of developing those types of things. But going to your doctor, or even consulting your doctor or even the doctors and nurse by phone is, I think, an appropriate reaction in not being afraid as the American public are.

As I mentioned, my friend at the University of Georgia has been telling the people within government, the government entities, the CDC and all, that this particular flu is not of epidemic proportions. It's not one that is going to be very virulent and, thus, is not going to create a lot of severe problems besides these two deaths, which are tragic. We have had very little problems in America with the flu.

And my friend also said with it being more widespread in Mexico, he doesn't really have the data but he thinks that probably in Mexico, where we have seen people die, a whole lot more than here, that it's probably the same proportion of deaths that we see with every flu epidemic. So people shouldn't be afraid.

He also tells me that there is a possibility that next fall we are going to see this same H1N1 flu virus come back to America and come back as a potential infection, viral infection, on a bigger scale; but people should just do the commonsense things to help them from having the flu, which means they should wash their hands. If somebody is running a fever, they should talk to

the doctor and not send the child to school who is running a fever.

They need to make sure that they keep their fingers out of their nose and keep their hands out of their mouth and things like this. It may be just common sense.

I have had some of the liberals who don't particularly like me in my district complain about my making those recommendations, but people don't think about those things. And it's important to do those commonsense things to prevent yourself from getting the flu. So we need to just do those commonsense epidemiological measures of trying to prevent ourselves from getting the flu and not be afraid.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I chuckled just a little bit at what Dr. BROWN was saying, but it is absolutely right. He is absolutely right. And, colleagues, I don't know, on Sunday morning you refer CNN or Fox News—I guess my Democratic colleagues, it's CNN; and my Republican colleagues, it's mostly Fox News. But they have a medical consultant, Sanjay Gupta on CNN, and Isadore Rosenfeld, a gentleman that I listen to.

Fortunately, they don't limit him to a 2-minute sound bite. On Sunday morning Dr. Rosenfeld has a 30-minute interview.

And he, Madam Speaker, he was so good and so practical and talked plain talk, just like Dr. BROWN about, you know, the risk and the relevant, what do you do. And I imagine that he will be talking about that this Sunday, Dr. Gupta probably as well on CNN.

But, generally, the information is outstanding, and I say that from the perspective of being a practicing physician, and Dr. BROWN as well, and they talk about cover your nose and mouth with a tissue when you cough or sneeze, wash your hands often with soap and water, especially after you cough or sneeze.

Avoid touching your eyes or your nose or your mouth, because germs definitely, as Dr. BROWN said, spread that way.

So it's so much common sense. And I commend Dr. Rosenfeld, Dr. Gupta and others, and of course earlier, Dr. BROWN, before you got here, Madam Speaker, knows that I talked about the response that we have gotten from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Governor Sebelius, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Governor Napolitano, the acting director of the CDC, Dr. Bessler, and on and on and on.

President Obama's response in regard to the budget, we talked about the fact that he said, well, let's put \$1.5 billion in case we have to develop a vaccine specific, in case this thing does become a pandemic, and we have got lots of folks that are getting very sick, and we need to go in that direction.

□ 2115

So I think the response has been good, but we need to make sure that we

don't overreact and we don't let the inappropriate media cause panic to set in. These good doctors that speak on these shows I think are doing a good job to prevent that from happening.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Dr. GINGREY is exactly right. And I want to know what this \$1.5 billion or \$2 billion that the President has proposed to spend on this flu outbreak is going to be spent on? Is it going to be a useful expenditure? Is it going to be needed?

We saw in 1976 under President Ford when they spent all that money that actually caused more harm than good. More people died and had disease from the vaccine. Now, we have better technology; in fact, the gentleman at the University of Georgia has just some outstanding technology today where they can help develop vaccines very quickly. But still, it takes a while to produce enough vaccines to be able to help if they are needed. And what we see in this particular flu outbreak is that I don't think they are needed. I don't think we need to be appropriating \$1.5 billion or \$2 billion for the H1N1 flu. We need to give those funds to our military personnel to keep them from dying in Afghanistan or Iraq.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, because that is a great segue for me; because, Madam Speaker, I represent a district, Marietta, Georgia, is part of it, Cobb County. Lockheed Martin has a plant there where we employ almost 8,000 great Georgians, probably a few folks from Alabama and surrounding States that work on those flight lines for the C-130 and also, more specifically, the F-22 Raptor.

The Department of Defense has made the decision to cancel that program at 187 F-22s, when originally we thought we needed 700, the military. The Air Force in particular has said, Madam Speaker, repeatedly that even 240 planes would put us in a moderate-risk situation, and all of a sudden this administration has made the decision to cancel that flight line and I think put us at a high-risk situation.

I feel very strongly that in this emergency supplemental there are four, and that is it, four of these F-22 Raptors that give us that fifth generation of air superiority, best in the world, and we are going to appropriate as a part of an emergency supplemental mainly for continuing to fight and win in Iraq and Afghanistan, particularly Afghanistan now; yet, we are going to spend \$2 billion possibly preparing a vaccine that will never be used?

Let me tell you what happens, Madam Speaker, with that vaccine if we produce it at 50 million or however many doses like they did back in 1976 when it only cost \$135 million. We might be spending \$2 billion on a vaccine that gets poured down the drain and is never used, and we could have purchased 15 or 20 F-22 Raptors.

Again, that is getting off on a tangent a little bit, but I feel like I really need to mention that because we have to prioritize our spending. We have to

do these things in an appropriate manner. We can't let all of our spending and our reaction be media driven in responding to a panic so that we don't get Katrina'd. And I would yield back to my colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would like the gentleman to clarify something for me. You made a statement, and I am not sure if I understood it.

It is my impression that actually it is the administration who decided to cancel the Raptor, the F-22. It wasn't the Air Force. Is that correct? What was the situation?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. He is absolutely correct.

Thirty different studies have suggested that we need a minimum to be able to have enough planes. We have a situation in Hawaii at Hickam Air Force Base where they only have one squadron, that is 20 F-22s, and the same thing is true at Tyndall in Florida. They have one squadron of 20 planes. And it is very possible that with the limit of 187, which the Air Force clearly has said on repeated occasions that that is not enough, that it puts the Air Force in a high-risk situation, that they may just have to BRAC those bases and take those planes and put them somewhere else, Elmendorf as an example or in Guam or Okinawa.

But, Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is absolutely correct that this was a decision that was made by the administration, and it was based on cost. It was not based on the needs, as repeatedly stated by the highest ranking members of the Air Force and by 30 different studies, that we need more planes.

We got off on a tangent, Madam Speaker, but it is important because what we are talking about as we discuss the appropriateness of spending \$2 billion to produce a vaccine that may never be used, that is a very important decision that our country has to make, and I think the American people need to understand that. So I thank the gentleman for asking that question, Madam Speaker, and I gladly yield back to Dr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. While we are talking about defense, let me point out something else, too, that was a cost decision evidently by this administration. The North Korean Government fired off a rocket. It wasn't quite successful, but they are working on intercontinental ballistic capability, and they are developing nuclear weapon technology in North Korea. We know that without a question. The day after the North Koreans fired off their rocket, our President announced that he was going to cut the antimissile defense spending. And we need that spending. We need an antimissile defense system in this country more than we ever have.

President Reagan suggested that we develop an umbrella over this country, an umbrella that would make nuclear

weapons totally obsolete. But this administration wants to cut that antimissile spending which we desperately need and is, in fact, one of the most important constitutional functions of the Federal Government.

We need the F-22 Raptor. We need the antimissile defense system. I don't think we need to spend \$1.5 billion on a flu vaccine when already the research shows that it is not going to be very virulent.

Before I yield back, I would like to make a very strong point here. We are stealing our grandchildren's future by borrowing and spending. We are borrowing too much, we are spending too much, we are taxing too much, and it has to stop. And we need to spend on things that are critical, that are constitutional, that have to do with our national defense, that have to do with our national security. And we need to drive things by science and not by hysteria. This hysteria over the flu is driving the media and is driving the administration, driving the leadership here. We have got to stop that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Let me reclaim my time and try to wrap up, Madam Speaker, as we get close to the allotted time.

What Dr. BROUN is talking about, my colleagues, I want you to think about what he said, if you think we have gotten a little afar from our starting point on talking about this H1N1 influenza. The health of the Nation is more than just protecting people from a pandemic, from disease, from infection. That is certainly a huge part of the responsibility of our government, to try to protect its citizens, and I think that we do a great job and we have a great health care system. But the health of the Nation also, as Dr. BROUN is suggesting so accurately, has to do with national defense and to make sure that our leadership understands the importance of us being respected. It is nice to be liked, and we all want to be liked. When our Commander in Chief goes to Latin America or goes to speak at the European Union or the Group of 20 or to Turkey or wherever, or visits our troops in Iraq, I think we need to understand the health of the Nation is more about freedom from disease. It is about strength. It is about character. It is about making the important decisions of where you spend the hard-earned tax dollars that 300 million people in this country have to write a check every April 15, that we have that responsibility, and we can't afford to squander one dime of it.

I am going to yield back to my colleague maybe for the final 30 seconds, but, Madam Speaker, I just want to say that during this hour, this Republican GOP Doctor's Caucus of which Dr. BROUN and I are a part, I want to point out this last slide. We are talking about strengthening the doctor-patient relationship, but we are talking about a lot of things tonight in regard to the health of the Nation.

With that, I want to yield back to my colleague for some closing comments, and then we will wrap up.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Very quickly, I want to bring out that the economic health of the government is very important for fiscal health, too. I think a lot of people who may be dying in Mexico is because of their poor economic health, and we are going down a road now with this tax-and-cap policy that is being fostered by the Democratic majority to tax energy, which is going to create a tremendous downturn in our economy. It is going to put people out of work. And we have got to stop that, too, because it is going to affect the physical health of those people who aren't able to buy their insurance, who aren't able to go to the drug store and buy their Tamiflu or their antibiotics. So economic health is going to be critical for physical health, and we have got to stop this cap-and-tax policy that NANCY PELOSI and company are trying to force down the throats of the American people.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Let me reclaim my time for the remaining minute or less. But Dr. BROUN I think, Madam Speaker, hit on a good point. We talked tonight mostly about the physical health of the country, the Nation, and the importance of providing that and protecting people from disease, if we can. But what Dr. BROUN mentioned, the fiscal health of the country, is almost as important if not as important. And so when we start recommending policy that a small group of zealots want us to go down a road of cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax, we can hurt this Nation just as badly by being fiscally irresponsible as physically irresponsible.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of the hospitalization of his child.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, May 12.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 12.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 12.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 6, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1591. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting A letter from the U.S. House of Representatives, Clerk, transmitting notification, pursuant to section 1(k)(2) of H.R. 895, One Hundred Tenth Congress, that the board members and alternate board members of the Office of Congressional Ethics; Former Congressman David Skaggs; Former Congressman Porter J. Goss; Former Congresswoman Yvonne Brathwaite Burke; Former House Chief Administrative Officer Jay Eagen; Former Congresswoman Karan English; Professor Allison Hayward; Former Congressman Abner Mikva; Former Congressman Bill Frenzel; Staff Director and Chief Counsel Leo J. Wise; Senior Counsel William H. Cable; Investigative Counsel Omar Ashmawy; Investigative Counsel Elizabeth A. Horton; and Administrative Director Mary K. Flanagan, have individually signed an agreement to not be a candidate for the office of Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress for purposes of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 until at least 3 years after the individual is no longer a member of the Board or staff of the Office of Congressional Ethics.

1592. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, agreement to not be a candidate for the office of Senator or Representative transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electronic Filing of Disclosure Documents (RIN: 3038-AC 67) received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1593. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Import/Export User Fees [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0144] (RIN: 0579-AC59) received March 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1594. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments (RIN: 0560-AH87) received April 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1595. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Sugar Program (RIN:

0560-AH86) received April 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1596. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002; Biennial Review and Republication of the Select Agent and Toxin List; Delay of Compliance Date for Newly Registered Entities [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0033] (RIN: 0579-AC53) received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1597. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Sweet Oranges and Grapefruit from Chile [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0115] (RIN: 0579-AC83) received April 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1598. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of the Hawaiian and Territorial Fruits and Vegetables Regulations; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0052] (RIN: 0579-AC70) received April 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1599. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling of Muscle Cuts of Beef (including Veal), Lamb, Chicken, Goat, and Pork; Ground Beef, Ground Lamb, Ground Chicken, Ground Goat, and Ground Pork — received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1600. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; New Mexico [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0124] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1601. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions; Correcting Amendment [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0042] (RIN: 0579-AC78) received April 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1602. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Tobacco Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB98) received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1603. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 2008 on the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1604. A letter from the Acting Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's annual report for fiscal year 2008 entitled, "No FEAR Act: Fiscal Year 2008 Annual Report to Congress", pursuant to Public Law 107-74; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1605. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information Systems and Chief Information Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's annual report for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1606. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1607. A letter from the Director Office of Civil Rights, International Broadcasting Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's annual report for fiscal year 2008 on the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1608. A letter from the Acting Chair, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 2008 on the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1609. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's annual report for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1610. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, transmitting the Office's annual report for fiscal year 2008 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1611. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009, pursuant to Public Law 109-55, section 1005; (H. Doc. No. 111—36); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1612. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA-46-350P and PA-46R-350T Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0007; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-072-AD; Amendment 39-15867; AD 2009-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1613. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model 717-200 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1155; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-146-AD; Amendment 39-15866; AD 2009-07-07 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1614. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-400, AT-401, AT-401B, AT-402, AT-402A, and AT-402B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23646; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-005-AD; Amendment 39-15849; AD 2006-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1615. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR Model ATR72 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1081; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-143-AD; Amendment 39-15864; AD 2009-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1616. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0074; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-15863; AD 2009-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1617. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80A Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1206; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-15869; AD 2009-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1618. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DORNIER LUFTFAHRT GmbH Models Dornier 228-100, Dornier 228-101, Dornier 228-200, Dornier 228-201, Dornier 228-202, and Dornier 228-212 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0123 Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-005-AD; Amendment 39-15868; AD 2009-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1619. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34-1A, -3A, -3A1, -3A2, -3B, and -3B1 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0419; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-52-AD; Amendment 39-15871; AD 2009-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1620. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Payments made to a REMIC pursuant to the Home Affordable Modification Program [Notice 2009-36] received April 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1621. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Asset Valuation under Section 430(g)(3)(B) as amended by WRERA [Notice 2009-22] received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1622. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Phase-out of Credit for New Qualified Hybrid Motor Vehicles and New Advanced Lean Burn Technology Motor Vehicles [Notice 2009-37] received April 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. PINGREE of Maine: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 400. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1728) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to reform consumer mortgage practices and provide accountability for such practices, to provide certain minimum standards for consumer mortgage loans, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-96). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the provisions of title 31, United States Code, relating to false claims to clarify and make technical amendments to those provisions, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUYER (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana):

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount of monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payable to surviving spouses by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself and Mrs. BONO MACK):

H.R. 2244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an individual who is entitled to receive child support a refundable credit equal to the amount of unpaid child support and to increase the tax liability of the individual required to pay such support by the amount of the unpaid child support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2245. A bill to authorize the President, in conjunction with the 40th anniversary of the historic and first lunar landing by humans in 1969, to award gold medals on behalf of the United States Congress to Neil A. Armstrong, the first human to walk on the moon; Edwin E. "Buzz" Aldrin, Jr., the pilot of the lunar module and second person to walk on the moon; Michael Collins, the pilot of their Apollo 11 mission's command module; and, the first American to orbit the Earth, John Herschel Glenn, Jr.; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2246. A bill to promote and enhance the operation of local building code enforcement administration across the country by establishing a competitive Federal matching grant program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make technical amendments to certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, enacted by the Congressional Review Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2248. A bill to establish a grant program to assist States in inspecting hotel rooms for bed bugs, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2249. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for increased price transparency of hospital information and to provide for additional research on consumer information on charges and out-of-pocket costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2250. A bill to immediately provide for domestic energy production and jobs and to pursue alternatives in renewable energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Science and Technology, Natural Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2251. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2252. A bill to improve the Federal infrastructure for health care quality improvement in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 2253. A bill to establish a Financial Markets Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2255. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to ensure that actions taken by regulatory agencies are subject to that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 2256. A bill to authorize the Archivist of the United States to make grants to States for the preservation and dissemination of historical records; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the outreach activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MCMAHON):

H.R. 2258. A bill to adjust the immigration status of certain Liberian nationals who were provided refuge in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KOSMAS (for herself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 2259. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the post-employment restrictions for Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2260. A bill to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education with increased authority with respect to asthma programs, and to provide for increased funding for such programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SPACE, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2261. A bill to designate Greece as a program country for purposes of the visa waiver program established under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANCE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REYES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 2262. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SUTTON:

H.R. 2263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting

periods for people with disabilities for entitlement to disability benefits and Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the election of the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDER (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. STUPAK):

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals of Smart Irrigation Month, which recognizes the advances in irrigation technology and practices that help raise healthy plants and increase crop yields while using water resources more efficiently and encourages the adoption of smart irrigation practices throughout the United States to further improve water-use efficiency in agricultural, residential, and commercial activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp in commemoration of Carl B. Stokes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. MASSA):

H. Res. 401. A resolution honoring the life and recognizing the far-reaching accomplishments of the Honorable Jack Kemp, Jr; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 402. A resolution condemning the transport of nuclear mixed-oxide (MOX) material by ship from France to Japan through international waters which endangers the marine environment and increases possible risks for destruction and likely attacks of such shipments by international pirates and terrorists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KIRK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. WU, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HARE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PRICE of North Caro-

lina, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. NYE, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 403. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Teacher Day to honor and celebrate teachers in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. POLIS of Colorado introduced a bill (H.R. 2264) for the relief of Maria Carlota Tribaldo, Jose Vladimir Orellana-Hernandez, Bernardo Tribaldo, Yulieth Tribaldo, and Yedssi Aceneth Moreno Forero; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. NYE and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 23: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 173: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 176: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 179: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 182: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 197: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 235: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 333: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 406: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 413: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 442: Mr. ROSS and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
H.R. 450: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 463: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 467: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. Grayson, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 481: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 504: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 509: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 510: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 556: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 621: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs. Dahlkemper, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. FOX, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 646: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 745: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 775: Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 868: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 890: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 949: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 958: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1030: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1067: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1074: Mr. DENT, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1111: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1179: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1193: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1203: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1210: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1214: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1247: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SIREs, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1255: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1269: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1277: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1289: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1322: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 1325: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1330: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 1343: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1354: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1378: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1380: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1410: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
H.R. 1428: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1452: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1454: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1470: Mr. PITTS and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1474: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1479: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1503: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1548: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1550: Mr. TURNER and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 1552: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. Cao, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DENT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1558: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1571: Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 1625: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1675: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 1684: Mr. BOREN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. McCAUL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1689: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1698: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1721: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1723: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1727: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1735: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1740: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1751: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1761: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1788: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1802: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 1816: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1826: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1835: Mr. NUNES, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1836: Mr. HARE and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1844: Mr. MASSA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1849: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1881: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KILROY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1888: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1908: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1910: Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 1912: Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 1959: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1985: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California

H.R. 1993: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 2009: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2014: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mrs. HALVORSON.

H.R. 2017: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2027: Mr. PENCE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. JONES, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 2062: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2067: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 2097: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 2102: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2103: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2105: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. KAP-TUR, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2106: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2109: Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2113: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 2118: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2119: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2138: Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 2149: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2160: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2194: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HODES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 2196: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2202: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2239: Mr. HARE.

H. J. Res. 47: Ms. FALLIN and Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MASSA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 111: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H. Res. 156: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 192: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. REYES, Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 209: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 232: Mr. DENT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H. Res. 248: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 299: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 331: Mr. CARDOZA.

H. Res. 360: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H. Res. 363: Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 386: Mr. BARROW, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. HELLER.

H. Res. 388: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHILDERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BOYD, Ms. ZOE Lofgren of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 396: Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOYD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. CALVERT.